DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 851 EC 232 196

AUTHOR Stephens, Susan A.; And Others
TITLE The Study of Programs of Instruction for Handicapped Children and Youth in Day and Residential Facilities. Volume I: Overview.
INSTITUTION Decision Resources Corp., Washington, DC.; Mathematica Policy Research, Princeton, N.J.; Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis.; Temple Univ., Philadelphia, Pa. Inst. for Survey Research.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 31 Jan 90
CONTRACT 300-85-0190
NOTE 224p.; For volumes 2-5, see EC 232 197-200. Tables I.1-III.25 contain small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Change Agents; *Day Programs; *Disabilities; Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; Institutional Role; National Surveys; Program Improvement; Residential Institutions; *Residential Programs; *School Districts; Special Education; Special Schools; *State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to carry out the mandate of the Education of the Handicapped Amendments of 1983 and 1986 which called for an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of procedures undertaken by state education agencies, local education agencies, and intermediate educational units to improve programs of instruction for handicapped children and youth in day or residential facilities. The facilities on which the study focused are those described as "separate"; i.e., residential or day facilities exclusively serving handicapped persons in buildings physically separate from those for their nonhandicapped peers. Research questions specifically addressed were: (1) What are the current number and characteristics of such facilities? (2) What types of educational opportunities and related services do children in these facilities receive? (3) What have been the patterns of change in these facilities? and (4) What factors have affected the practices of facilities and patterns of change? A survey was conducted of 2,580 facilities, from which total 1,941 replies were received for a response rate of 75%. Additionally, data were gathered from 50 special education divisions of state education agencies, including the District of Columbia (one state failed to respond); and case studies were conducted of eight state education agencies and of three facilities within each state. An extended summary of findings, which comprises the remainder of this volume, is organized into three sections: (1) a national profile of separate facilities; (2) a review of state special education procedures that can influence separate facilities; and (3) an analysis of changes at separate facilities since the passage of Public Law 94-142 and the factors associated with those changes. Findings show that separate facilities have noted such changes as increased individualized program planning and evaluation, increased parental involvement, and to some extent, more opportunities for interaction with nonhandicapped peers. Changes in social expectations about the developmental potential and life contributions of handicapped persons have led to increased emphasis on life skills training, vocational training, and transition planning. State education agency procedures have played a significant role in fostering change at separate facilities, especially through setting regulatory standards, offering technical assistance, and monitoring compliance. Several avenues for further research are suggested. Includes 23 references. (JDD)

ED324851

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE STUDY OF PROGRAMS OF INSTRUCTION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN DAY AND RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

VOLUME I: OVERVIEW

EC232196

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

THE STUDY OF PROGRAMS OF INSTRUCTION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN DAY AND RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

VOLUME I: OVERVIEW

January 31, 1990

Authors:

Susan A. Stephens
K. Charlie Lakin
Marsha Brauen
Fran O'Reilly

Prepared by:

Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs
Mary C. Switzer Building
330 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Project Officer:
Susan Thompson-Hoffman

Prepared by:

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393

Principal Investigators:
Susan A. Stephens
K. Charlie Lakin

"This report has been funded, either wholly or in part, with Federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education under prime contract no. 300-85-0190 with Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. In performance of the prime contract, the University of Minnesota, Decision Resources, Inc., and the Temple University Institute for Survey Research were subcontractors. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government or Mathematica Policy Research, Inc."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Study of Programs of Instruction for Handicapped Children and Youth in Day and Residential Facilities benefitted from the time and expertise contributed by a large number of persons throughout the more than four years the project was underway. These persons included project staff, staff at the U.S. Department of Education, the Technical Advisory Committee and other experts called upon at various stages of the project, State special education division staff across the nation, staff in various other public and private agencies in the eight case study States, and, most importantly, the administrators and staff at the separate facilities contacted throughout the course of the study. As Project Director, I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all of these persons.

MPR project staff included:

Stuart Kerachsky, who participated in the initial design of the project

Todd Ensor, who made major contributions to the development of the sample frame and instrument for the Survey of Separate Facilities

Patricia Rossi, who supervised the coding and entry of the sample frame data and kept track of project budget and expenses

Rhoda Cohen and Jacqueline Donath, who managed the Survey of Separate Facilities; Ms. Donath also supervised the coding and data entry of the survey data

Ellen Hostettler, who supervised a crew of excellent interviewers during the process of following nonrespondents to the Survey of Separate Facilities, obtaining telephone interviews, and resolving data problems through call-backs to respondents

Michael Watts, who developed the CATI programs necessary to administer the screening interview for the Survey of Separate Facilities

Linda Sperling, who implemented the complex sampling plan to select facilities for the Survey of Separate Facilities and managed the large and complex data set from data entry through the preparation of final analysis data tapes

John Hall, who provided sampling consultation during the preparation of the final report on the Survey of Separate Facilities

Barbara DiClemente, who prepared the data entry programs for the Survey of Separate Facilities

Marianne Stevenson, who oversaw the data entry of the questionnaire documents for the Survey of Separate Facilities

Joy Gianolio, who managed the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions, including numerous followup contacts to obtain complete responses and clarify issues in the interpretation of data from the survey; Ms. Gianolio also participated in the facility-level case studies and in the preparation of the final report

Daniel Buckley, who prepared a PC-based data entry program for the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions and carried out the analyses of those data

Steven Rioux, who prepared initial drafts of analyses based on the case study data

Michelle Mueller, who helped in the production of drafts of the final report

Lynne Beres, Stephanie Collins, Denise Dunn, Gloria Gustus, Yvette McKnight, and other secretaries who helped prepare various documents throughout the course of the project

Nancy Hennessey, who helped coordinate the secretarial efforts, particularly during the production of the final report

Thomas Good, who provided editorial assistance for the final report

Consultants and subcontractors to MPR included:

Staff of the Center for Community and Residential Services, University of Minnesota, including the co-principal investigator for the project, K. Charlie Lakin, who had major responsibility for the design of the instrument and analysis plan for the Survey of Separate Facilities and the initial drafts of Volume II; Robert Bruininks, who participated in the initial design of the project; Bradley Hill, who undertook the task of implementing the analysis plan for the survey data and supervised the work of programmer Tsuey-Hwa Chen; and Steve McGuire and Cheryl Morgan, who provided excellent secretarial support, with special thanks to Ms. Morgan for her careful attention to detail in the preparation of tables from the survey data.

Staff of Decision Resources Corporation, Inc., including Marsha Brauen, who was a major participant in the development, conduct, and analysis of the State and facility case studies and in the preparation of Volume III of the final report, and Nancy Beller-Simms and Katherine White, who conducted several facility case study site visits

Fran O'Reilly, who also played a major role in the development, conduct, and analysis of the State and facility case studies and in the preparation of Volume III of the final report

Ross Taylor, who reviewed the various project reports from the standpoint of extensive contact with State special education divisions

Eugene Ericksen, who developed the sample design, modified it as circumstances dictated, prepared the sample weights, and conducted analyses of standard errors of estimates for the Survey of Separate Facilities

Staff of the Institute for Survey Research, Temple University, who participated in the screening effort for the Survey of Separate Facilities, including Alan Walters, who oversaw the project there, and Cynthia Marconi, the interviewing supervisor

Staff at the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education, provided direction and oversight for the project. In addition to Susan Thompson-Hoffman, who was the Project Officer, James Button, Louis Danielson, and Martin Kaufman provided valuable input into critical design decisions and the review of the final report.

The project benefitted greatly from the advice of various outside experts, some of whom served on the Technical Advisory Committee. We are grateful to the following persons who provided valuable ideas and critical review at important junctures throughout the project:

Elizabeth Boggs

John Clark
State of Nebraska

Edward DeForrest
Spaudling Youth Center

Gerilee Gustason
formerly at Gallaudet University, now at San Jose State University

Luanna Meyer
Syracuse University

Susan Nelson
formerly with National Association of Private Schools for Exceptional Children

Arthur Schildroth
Gallaudet University

Dennis Thurman
CEARSVH

Robert Van Dyke
South Metropolitan Association

Margaret Niederer from the Division of Special Education in Illinois was the CEIS monitor for the project and was a touchstone for relevance and clarity in all aspects of the study, from instrumentation to reports.

State special education staff in the eight case study States were invaluable in providing the information necessary for the study and in arranging access to other individuals and to separate facilities. The project liaison person in each State deserves special thanks for coordinating site visits and subsequently reviewing reports:

California - Allen Coltharp

Connecticut - Paul Flinter

Florida - Landis Stetler

Illinois - Archie Burgett

Louisiana - Jack Benson

New Jersey - Eileen Ware

Ohio - Kathleen Schindler

South Carolina - Carolyn Knight

Finally, though anonymous, the many individuals--administrators and staff--at schools and residential facilities throughout the nation who generously gave their time to provide the information for this study. It is my hope, and that of my colleagues, that this report reflects the tremendous importance of their work and their contributions to the lives of many thousands of students with handicaps.

Susan A. Stephens
Project Director

CONTENTS

Contents		Page
VOLUME I		
I	BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
	A. DEVELOPMENT OF P.L. 94-142	3
	B. EXISTING KNOWLEDGE ON SEPARATE FACILITIES	7
	1. Aggregate Trends in Placement Rates in Special Schools	8
	2. Variation in Residential Placements by Type of Disability	11
	C. IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS STUDY	14
II	STUDY DESIGN AND PRODUCTS	17
	A. COMPONENTS OF STUDY DESIGN	17
	B. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF STUDY DESIGN	21
	1. The Facility as the Unit of Sampling and Observation	22
	2. Focus on Separate Facilities	23
	3. Measuring Change	24
	4. Small Number of Case Studies	25
	C. DATA COLLECTION RESULTS AND STUDY PRODUCTS	25
	1. Summary of Data Collection Results	26
	2. Organization of Report	27
III	A NATIONAL PROFILE OF SEPARATE FACILITIES PROVIDING SPECIAL EDUCATION TO STUDENTS WITH HANDICAPS	29
	A. NUMBER OF SEPARATE FACILITIES AND STUDENTS	29
	B. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS	43
	1. Severity of Handicapping Condition and Secondary Disabilities	43
	2. Demographic Characteristics	48
	C. STUDENT MOVEMENT INTO AND OUT OF SEPARATE FACILITIES	52
	1. Admissions	52
	2. Releases	58
	D. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES	66
	1. Off-Campus Programs	66
	2. Primary Instructional Setting	70
	3. Student Evaluations	72
	4. Noninstructional Activities	73
	E. STAFF AT SEPARATE FACILITIES	80
	F. ADMINISTRATIVE AND COST CHARACTERISTICS OF SEPARATE FACILITIES	85

CONTENTS (continued)

Contents		Page
VOLUME I (continued)		
IV	STATE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCEDURES AFFECTING SEPARATE FACILITIES	91
	A. STATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS AND THE ROLE OF SEPARATE FACILITIES	92
	B. SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION WITHIN THE STATE EDUCATION AGENCY	95
	C. FUNDING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS	97
	1. State Funding of LEA Special Education Programs	97
	2. State Funding of Out-of-District Placements	102
	3. Use of Federal Funds	104
	D. SPECIAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND MONITORING	108
	1. Special Education Standards	109
	2. Monitoring of Special Education Programs	110
	E. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, IN-SERVICE TRAINING, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, AND DISSEMINATION	116
	1. Technical Assistance and In-Service Training	116
	2. Program Development and Dissemination	118
	F. SUMMARY OF STATE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCEDURES	120
	1. State Economic and Educational Context	120
	2. Structure of State Special Education Systems	121
	3. Special Education Funding	122
	4. Special Education Standards and Compliance Monitoring	123
	5. Technical Assistance, In-Service Training, Program Development, and Dissemination	124
	6. Summary	125
V	CHANGES AND FACTORS AFFECTING CHANGE AT SEPARATE FACILITIES	127
	A. CHANGES IN THE STUDENT POPULATION AND THE MISSION OF SEPARATE FACILITIES	127
	B. CHANGES IN FACILITY STAFFING AT SEPARATE FACILITIES	136
	1. Quality of Staff	137
	2. Type of Staff Employed	137
	3. Ease of Recruiting and Retaining Staff	139
	4. Staff-to-Student Ratios	141
	5. Staff Development	142
	6. Staff Evaluation	144
	C. CHANGES IN STUDENT INTEGRATION AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	144
	1. Opportunities for Interaction with Nonhandicapped Peers	145
	2. Parental Involvement	148

CONTENTS (continued)

Contents — Page

VOLUME I (continued)

D. CHANGES IN PROGRAMS AND METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AT SEPARATE FACILITIES 150
1. Individualized Education and Transition Plans 151
2. Changes in Life Skills and Vocational Education 154
3. Increased Use of Treatment and Behavioral Goals in Educational Programming 158
4. Program Evaluation 159

VI SUMMARY 161

REFERENCES 167

LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
VOLUME I		
I.1	PERCENTAGE OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (3-21 YEARS) EDUCATED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 94-142 WHO WERE EDUCATED IN DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS	10
I.2	PERCENTAGE OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN EDUCATED AT DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS, BY TYPE OF HANDICAP, FOR THE 1985-1986 SCHOOL YEAR	12
III.1	ESTIMATED NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED BY FACILITY AND OPERATING AGENCY	30
III.2	DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE SCHOOL STUDENTS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY OF STUDENTS AND OPERATING AGENCY (Number of Students Age 0-21)	31
III.3	ESTIMATED NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE DAY SCHOOLS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED BY FACILITY AND OPERATING AGENCY	33
III.4	ESTIMATED NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED BY FACILITY AND OPERATING AGENCY	34
III.5	ESTIMATED NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE DAY SCHOOL STUDENTS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED BY FACILITY AND OPERATING AGENCY (Number of Students Age 0-21)	35
III.6	ESTIMATED NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL STUDENTS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED BY FACILITY AND OPERATING AGENCY (Number of Students Age 0-21)	36
III.7	DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE DAY SCHOOL STUDENTS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY OF STUDENTS AND OPERATING AGENCY (Number of Students Age 0-21)	37

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Tables		Page
VOLUME I (continued)		
III.8	DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL STUDENTS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY OF STUDENTS AND OPERATING AGENCY (Number of Students Age 0-21)	38
III.9	DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE DAY SCHOOL STUDENTS BY TYPE AND/OR SEVERITY OF PRIMARY HANDICAPPING CONDITION	44
III.10	DISTRIBUTION OF SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL STUDENTS BY TYPE AND/OR SEVERITY OF PRIMARY HANDICAPPING CONDITION	45
III.11	PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT SEPARATE FACILITIES WITH NO SECONDARY DISABILITY, BY PRIMARY DISABILITY OF STUDENT AND BY PROGRAM TYPE AND OPERATING AGENCY	47
III.12	PERCENT OF SEPARATE DAY SCHOOL STUDENTS BY AGE AND PRIMARY DISABILITY OF STUDENT	49
III.13	PERCENT OF SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL STUDENTS BY AGE AND PRIMARY DISABILITY OF STUDENT	50
III.14	SUMMARY OF DAY STUDENT MOVEMENT IN SEPARATE DAY SCHOOLS IN 1987: TYPE, NUMBER, AND RATE OF MOVEMENT PER 100 STUDENTS IN DAY SCHOOLS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED BY FACILITY	53
III.15	SUMMARY OF ALL STUDENT MOVEMENT IN SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS IN 1987: PERCENT OF TOTAL STUDENTS IN RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED BY FACILITY	54
III.16	AGE DISTRIBUTION OF NEW STUDENT ADMISSIONS AT SEPARATE DAY SCHOOLS IN 1987 BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY (Percent of New Admissions Age 0-21)	55
III.17	AGE DISTRIBUTION OF NEW ADMISSIONS AT SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS IN 1987 BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY (Percent of New Residential Admissions Age 0-21)	56
III.18	PROVISION OF SERVICES BY SEPARATE DAY SCHOOLS TO EXITING STUDENTS, BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY (Percent by Day Schools)	60

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Tables		Page
VOLUME I (continued)		
III.19	PROVISION OF SERVICES BY SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS TO EXITING RESIDENTIAL AND DAY STUDENTS, BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY (Percent of Residential Schools)	63
III.20	SEPARATE DAY SCHOOL STUDENTS ATTENDING EDUCATIONAL OR DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS ON OR OFF CAMPUS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY (Percent of Students)	67
III.21	SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL STUDENTS ATTENDING EDUCATIONAL OR DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS ON OR OFF CAMPUS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY (Percent of Students)	68
III.22	SEPARATE DAY SCHOOL STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES DURING PREVIOUS MONTH AND PARTICIPATING WITH NON-HANDICAPPED PEERS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY (Percent of Students)	74
III.23	SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES DURING PREVIOUS MONTH AND PARTICIPATING WITH NON-HANDICAPPED PEERS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY (Percent of Students)	77
III.24	STAFF AVAILABILITY AT SEPARATE DAY SCHOOLS BY TYPE OF STAFF AND PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY (Average Hours Per Week Per Type of Staff Per Student)	81
III.25	STAFF AVAILABILITY AT SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS BY TYPE OF STAFF AND PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY (Average Hours Per Week Per Type of Staff Per Student)	82
III.26	COSTS REPORTED BY SEPARATE DAY SCHOOLS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED	86
III.27	COSTS REPORTED BY SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED	87
III.28	COST DATA FOR SEPARATE DAY SCHOOLS BY OPERATING AGENCY	88
III.29	COST DATA FOR SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS BY OPERATING AGENCY	89

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Tables		Page
VOLUME I (continued)		
IV.1	PERCENT OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS SERVED IN ALL SEPARATE DAY AND RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENTS BY HANDICAPPING CONDITION 1986-87	94
IV.2	MAJOR ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES OF DIVISIONS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN CASE STUDY STATES	96
IV.3	FUNDING FORMULA USED TO DISTRIBUTE SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDS TO LEAS	99
IV.4	ALLOCATION OF STATE'S FEDERAL GRANT UNDER EHA-B IN 1987-88 SCHOOL YEAR (Percent)	106
IV.5	FREQUENCY OF ON-SITE MONITORING FOR PUBLIC SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AMONG CASE STUDY STATES, BY TYPE OF PROGRAM MONITORED (Frequency in Years)	111
IV.6	EXISTENCE AND FREQUENCY OF OFF-SITE REVIEWS IN MONITORING PROCESS	112
IV.7	HOW SPECIAL EDUCATION MONITORING IS CONDUCTED IN RELATION TO OTHER SEA MONITORING ACTIVITIES	113
IV.8	ASSESSMENT BY SEA SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION STAFF OF IMPACT OF MONITORING (Number of States Responding in Each Category)	115
IV.9	ROLE OF SEA SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION STAFF AND SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE/MATERIALS CENTERS AS PRIMARY AND SECONDARY PROVIDERS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND INFORMATION (Number of States Responding in Each Category)	117
IV.10	MAJOR DIFFERENCES AMONG CASE STUDY STATES IN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING	119

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Tables		Page
VOLUME I (continued)		
V.1	CHANGES IN NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED IN SEPARATE FACILITIES SURVEYED IN 1979 AND 1988	128
V.2	DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY PRIMARY HANDICAPPING CONDITION AT SEPARATE FACILITIES SURVEYED IN 1979 AND 1988	131
V.3	REPORTED CHANGE IN SEVERITY OF IMPAIRMENT OF STUDENT POPULATIONS OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS OPERATING IN 1976 AND 1988	133
V.4	AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE OR DECREASE IN PROPORTION OF STUDENTS BY AGE IN SEPARATE SCHOOLS OPERATING IN 1976 AND 1988	134
V.5	PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS AGREEING WITH STATEMENT REGARDING CHANGES IN STAFF QUALITY	138
V.6	PERCEPTION OF PERSONNEL PROBLEMS AT SEPARATE FACILITIES (Percent of Schools Reporting Problem as Very Serious)	140
V.7	PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS AGREEING WITH STATEMENT ABOUT CHANGE IN OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERACTION WITH NONHANDICAPPED PEERS	146
V.8	PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS AGREEING WITH STATEMENT ABOUT CHANGE IN CONTACT WITH PARENTS	149
V.9	PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS AGREEING WITH STATEMENTS REGARDING CHANGES IN USE OF INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PLANS	153
V.10	PERCENT OF SEPARATE FACILITIES REPORTING CHANGES AND VERY SERIOUS PROBLEMS IN SECURING APPROPRIATE PLACEMENTS FOR EXITING STUDENTS	155

I. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA) Amendments of 1983 and 1986 required the U.S. Department of Education to collect information on special education programs for children and youth with handicaps in separate facilities. The mandate called for: "an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of procedures undertaken by each State education agency, local education agency, and intermediate educational unit to improve programs of instruction for handicapped children and youth in day or residential facilities" (Section 618(f)(2)(E) of P.L. 98-199). To respond to this mandate, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) awarded a contract to Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR), Decision Resources Corporation, Inc. (DRC), and the University of Minnesota to conduct the Study of Programs of Instruction for Handicapped Children and Youth in Day and Residential Facilities. An advisory board, representing the interests of special education students in separate facilities, was convened several times during the course of the project to provide direction for the study design, as well as the design of survey instruments. The advisory board members also reviewed the draft final reports of this study.

The facilities on which this study focused are referred to in this report as separate facilities. A separate facility was defined for the purposes of this study as a residential or day facility exclusively serving handicapped persons in buildings physically separate from programs for non-handicapped age peers. Eligible separate facilities may be operated by the State education agency, other State agencies, local education agencies, county or regional

agencies, or private organizations. The special education services at these facilities may be provided by the operating agency or by another agency. However, correctional facilities and those with average lengths of stay of less than 30 days were excluded from this study.

A residential separate facility was defined as a separate facility at which at least some handicapped persons reside and at which at least some students ages 0 to 22 receive educational services on the grounds of the facility during the usual school day. It is important to note, with regard to residential schools or facilities, that many students are placed primarily for reasons other than to receive special education services. These placement decisions may be made to provide relatively short-term medical or psychological treatments or long-term residential care. A separate day school or facility was defined as a separate facility at which no handicapped persons reside and at which students ages 0 to 22 receive educational services during the usual school day.

There were four specific goals identified for the Study of Programs of Instruction for Handicapped Children and Youth in Day and Residential Facilities:

- To provide nationally representative estimates of the current status of education afforded to handicapped children and youth in separate facilities
- To describe changes in the population and services of separate facilities since the passage of P.L. 94-142
- To describe procedures used by State educational agencies (SEAs) to improve the instructional programs at separate day and residential facilities

- To describe the influence of State procedures on changes in facility practice, as well as the influence of other factors such as the procedures of local and intermediate education agencies.

This overview volume of the final report for the Study of Programs of Instruction for Handicapped Children and Youth in Day and Residential Facilities briefly describes the study design, summarizes the major findings of the research, and suggests further areas for investigation. The remainder of this chapter describes the interests of the special education community, the States, and Congress that led to the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) in 1975, particularly those sections affecting students in separate facilities, and the state of knowledge on separate facilities. The chapter ends with a brief discussion of the implications of this background for the design of the study.

A. DEVELOPMENT OF P.L. 94-142

Special education programs were first offered to students with hearing and visual impairments in the early 1800s when some States established residential schools for these populations; the American School for the Deaf was established in Hartford, Connecticut in 1817. Later, schools were developed for students with mental retardation. Private charitable, religious, and philanthropic organizations also established schools for students with handicaps at a time when most local school districts were not required to provide special education services. Private schools for students with handicaps continued to play a major role in the education system, particularly in States where private schools provided general education to

relatively large numbers of students. State-operated separate schools also continued to serve students with handicaps, as did numerous local districts.

In 1975, Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), after ten years of effort by numerous advocacy and interest groups, provider organizations, States, and individuals to expand the emerging Federal role in education into the arena of special education. This landmark legislation went into effect on October 1, 1977. It established that a free appropriate public education was a right to which handicapped children are entitled, and that this right would be provided under Federal protection. Prior to that Act, the Federal role in supporting special education had been established through such legislation as the Education of Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 89-750, Title VI, Elementary and Secondary Education Act), enacted in 1966, which gave grants to States and established the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped within the Federal Office of Education, and P.L. 89-313, which amended Title I of ESEA to provide grants for students in State-operated or supported schools for the handicapped. The latter legislation had a profound impact on special education in the United States in two ways. First, it provided the funds for the personnel, equipment, and materials necessary to provide education to children who in some cases had previously received only custodial care. Second, it established more firmly the approach of providing categorical aid for the education of students with handicaps. (See Martin, 1968, for a more detailed discussion of the legislative history of Federal programs for handicapped students.[1])

---

[1]For more information on the background to and history of P.L. 94-142, also see Martin (1971), Lavor (1976), and Levine and Wexler (1981).

In developing a national policy for educating handicapped children, Congress was advised by various interest groups, including the National Association for Retarded Citizens (an organization of parents and others interested in the rights of and services for persons with mental retardation), the Council for Exceptional Children (primarily an organization of special education professionals), and multiple organizations representing many of the specific disability groups. States, including Massachusetts and New York, and local districts that had extended public education broadly to students with handicaps were also influential in their testimony before Congress. The interest of Congress in developing such legislation was founded not simply on the perceived necessity of improving inadequate services, particularly to the most severely handicapped students, but also on the Constitutionally guaranteed right of handicapped children to a public-school education (under the same conditions as public education is provided to nonhandicapped children). These guarantees had previously been established in two landmark court cases: PARC v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1971) and Mills v. D.C. Board of Education (1972).

In the PARC case, the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens (PARC) challenged a Pennsylvania law that excluded children classified as "uneducable" or "unable to profit" from further public-school education. In the consent decree negotiated subsequent to the 1971 trial, the State agreed to place each handicapped child in a "free, public program of education and training appropriate to the child's capacity." The State also agreed that a continuum of educational placements should be available to students with disabilities. In the Mills judgment, which followed shortly after the

approval of the PARC consent degree, the courts ordered the District of Columbia to provide "each child of school age a free and suitable publicly supported education regardless of the degree of the child's mental, physical, or emotional disability or impairment" (348 F. Supp. at 878). In addition to concurring with PARC that "placement in a regular school class with appropriate ancillary services is preferable to placement in a special school class," Mills established procedural safeguards for the placement of children in alternative education settings.

Together, these two cases contributed fundamental rights to education as defined in statute. Public Law 94-142 focused specifically on rectifying discrimination in educational opportunities available to handicapped students. Seen as an extension of civil rights to persons with handicaps, the key provision of the Act was the guarantee that handicapped children[2] (defined by Congress as school-age children and youths who are mentally retarded, deaf, hearing impaired, vision impaired, speech impaired, emotionally disturbed, orthopedically handicapped, learning disabled, other health impaired, deaf-blind, or multiply handicapped) receive a "free appropriate public education," defined by Congress as follows:

> The term "free appropriate public education" means special education and related services which (A) have been provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge, (B) meet the standards of the State education agency, (C) include an appropriate preschool, elementary, or secondary education in the state involved, and (D) are provided in conformity with the individualized education program. [Sec. 602 (18)]

---

[2]Subsequent amendments to EHA have broadened the age ranges for services to include children with handicaps from birth through the age of 21.

P.L. 94-142 forwarded four basic principles in guaranteeing the right of handicapped children to an education:

1. That no handicapped children should be deprived of an appropriate educational program carried out by qualified teachers, no matter how severe their impairments (the nonexclusion principle)

2. That the educational program provided to each handicapped child be designed specifically for him/her and be contained in a written plan (the individualized education program principle)

3. That handicapped children be educated with their nonhandicapped peers to the maximum extent appropriate (the least restrictive alternative principle)

4. That parents participate and have access to due-process procedures in identifying, assessing, and planning programs for handicapped children (the patient participation and due process principle)

In the provisions of P.L. 94-142, Congress clearly conveyed its concern that handicapped children in separate public and private residential facilities, other out-of-home residential placements, and separate day schools also receive a "free and appropriate education" governed by the same assurances as those applicable to more integrated settings. At the same time, Congress recognized that designing an appropriate individualized program of instruction for some handicapped students could require placement in a separate day or residential environment.

B. EXISTING KNOWLEDGE ON SEPARATE FACILITIES

The Study of Programs of Instruction for Handicapped Children and Youth in Day or Residential Facilities is the first Congressionally mandated study designed specifically to study day and residential facilities which primarily

or exclusively serve handicapped children and youths. Policymakers, program planners, researchers, educators, and parents have previously relied on data collected by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) Survey of Special Purpose Facilities in 1978-79, conducted in response to the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The OCR Survey offers certain useful data by which quantitatively based assessments of the characteristics of separate facilities can be made (e.g., staffing patterns, student characteristics, and available services). In general, however, the OCR Survey does not include extensive questions about the educational programs offered by special purpose or separate facilities and detailed information on these facilities and their students. Moreover, because the OCR data were gathered prior to the full implementation of P.L. 94-142, this information is believed not to characterize the present nature of day and residential facilities.

In the remainder of this section, other current information on the educational services available to handicapped students in separate day and residential facilities is briefly reviewed.

1. Aggregate Trends in Placement Rates in Special Schools

The primary source of national and State-by-State information on separate educational placements is the State-reported data that each State is required to provide to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) of the U.S.

Department of Education on an annual basis.[3] These reports include placement data on whether handicapped students are being served in regular classes (both full- and part-time), separate classes (in regular school settings), separate schools (handicapped-only schools), and other environments (including hospitals, home-bound instruction, etc.).[4] An examination of the aggregate data gathered in the 1976-1977 to 1986-1987 school years (see Table I.1) suggests that very little change has been made in the use of separate facilities for the education of handicapped students. Of all children and youth (ages 3 to 21 years) who were receiving special education services under Public Laws 94-142 and 89-313 in the 1976-1977 school year, about 9 percent were in separate settings ("special schools" and "other environments" combined); by 1986-1987, the proportion had declined slightly to about 7 percent.

However, a more substantial decrease can be noted if one examines only the traditional school-age population (ages 6 to 17 years). Among this group of children, the total number in placements outside the regular school environment declined from 270,000 to 205,000, or by about 24 percent, between

---

[3]While a great deal of care is taken at both the State and Federal levels to ensure the accuracy of and to verify these data, changes in definitions or in classification and reporting procedures have resulted in some year-to-year and State-to-State fluctuations in the number of students reported with particular handicapping conditions, especially mental retardation. To the extent that definitions or classification and reporting procedures vary by type of placement, the State-reported data may not fully represent how students with similar conditions and educational needs are distributed.

[4]Beginning in the 1984-1985 school year, the categories by which States were to report the placement of handicapped students changed to include regular classes, resource room, separate classes, public separate (day) facility, private separate (day) facility, public residential facility, private residential facility, correctional facility, and homebound or hospital environment.

TABLE I.1

PERCENTAGE OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (3-21 YEARS) EDUCATED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 94-142 WHO WERE EDUCATED IN DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS

Educational Setting	76-77	77-78	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86	86-87
At least some regular class[a]	67	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68
Special class in regular school	25	25	26	25	25	25	25	25	24	242	25
Special separate school[b]	6	5	4	5	6	6	6	6	7	7	6
Other settings (homebound), hospitals, etc.)	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education (previously Office of Education), 1979 through 1989.

NOTES: Beginning with the 1984-85 school year, States were asked to provide data using somewhat different categories than in previous years, primarily to provide more detailed breakdowns of types of separate schools (public or private, day or residential). Includes all of the United States and insular areas. May not add to 100 percent within column due to rounding.

[a]In regular classroom with or without resource room services.

[b]Includes correctional facilities, which included 0.3 percent of all handicapped students in 1986-87.

the 1976-1977 and 1983-1984 school years.[5] The proportion of all school-age handicapped children who were receiving special education in separate settings declined from about 8 percent to 5.4 percent over this period. Although only a modest reduction occurred in the number and proportion of school-age handicapped students who were identified as special school placements, a very sharp reduction occurred in the proportion of handicapped students who were placed in "other environments" (from 2.6 percent to 0.8 percent).

Even greater than the variation by the age of the pupil, placements in special schools and in homebound or hospital settings vary by the handicapping condition of students, as shown in Table I.2. Among the students who were most likely to be separated from nonhandicapped peers during the school day in the 1985-1986 school year were deaf-blind (52 percent), multiply handicapped (37 percent), hearing impaired (26 percent) and visually impaired (25 percent) students. Seldom placed in such settings were learning disabled and speech or language impaired children.

2. Variation in Residential Placements by Type of Disability

Of particular interest in this study are handicapped children and youths in residential care. As noted earlier, Congress was particularly concerned about extending the protections of P.L. 94-142 to this group. However, when multiple data sources are examined, the available information on handicapped children in residential placements and the nature of the education which they receive is at best inconsistent both across and, in some cases, within the handicap groups.

---

[5]The 1983-84 data were the last published data that were available at the time of this report.

TABLE I.2

PERCENTAGE OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN EDUCATED AT DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS, BY TYPE OF HANDICAP, FOR THE 1985-1986 SCHOOL YEAR

Type of Handicap[a]	Educational Setting			
	Regular Class or Resource Room	Special Class Regular School	Special School[b]	Homebound/ Hospital
Learning Disabled	77	21	2	0
Speech Impaired	92	5	2	0
Mentally Retarded	28	56	15	0
Emotionally Disturbed	43	36	19	2
Hard of Hearing and Deaf	40	35	25	1
Visually Handicapped	55	19	24	1
Orthopedically Impaired	42	32	18	8
Other Health Impaired	45	26	12	18
Multi-handicapped	19	43	34	3
Deaf-blind	24	23	51	1
TOTAL	68	24	7	1

SOURCE: Table BC1, U.S. Department of Education (1988).

NOTE: Includes all of the United States and insular areas. May not add to 100 percent across row due to rounding. Includes students ages 3 through 21.

[a] These categories were defined by Federal regulations and used by States in reports to the Department of Education. The Survey of Separate Facilities, discussed later in this report, provided somewhat different and more detailed definitions, as well as additional categories.

[b] Includes correctional facilities, which included 0.3 percent of all handicapped students in 1985-1986.

An examination of the information on students categorized under three handicapping conditions (emotionally disturbed, mentally retarded, and hearing impaired or deaf) confirms the inadequate state of knowledge on students in residential placements. For example, statistics on resident patients in State and county mental hospitals gathered by the National Institute on Mental Health suggest a pronounced tendency toward a reduction in the population of children and youth residing in state and county mental hospitals. On the other hand, data sources from surveys, such as the survey conducted by the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration (1983) for the 1966-1981 period, suggest a substantial increase in the overall placement rate of children and youth in residential facilities for the emotionally disturbed. But in neither case does the available information provide substantive knowledge on the nature of the educational and related services offered to such children in residential facilities.

Information on the growth trends of residential placements for children with mental retardation are considerably less ambiguous than those available on emotionally disturbed children. Too, adequate information exists on the demographic and clinical characteristics of the mentally retarded children and youth in residential care. However, only a 1979 interview study by Lakin, Hill, Bruininks, and Hauber (1983) provides satisfactory information on the nature of the educational services provided to such children.

Finally, in contrast to the rather scanty information available on the educational programs provided to children and youth in residential settings with emotional disturbance, mental illness, and mental retardation, relatively detailed and comprehensive information has been gathered nationally on

separate programs for the hearing impaired or deaf children and youths in The American Annals of the Deaf.[6] The Annual Survey of Hearing Impaired Children and Youth,[7] conducted yearly by Gallaudet Research Institute, also provides data on deaf students and their placement patterns, including attendance at residential facilities.

C. IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS STUDY

While the group of children served at separate day and residential facilities represents only a relatively small proportion of all handicapped children identified within the United States, they are a particularly important group for several reasons. First, it is generally assumed that, on average, they are more severely handicapped than other handicapped children who attend regular, rather than separate or special, schools. Second, the proportion of children in separate day programs or residential facilities varies dramatically among age and handicap groups and across States. Third, while integration ("mainstreaming" and "deinstitutionalization") has been a powerful social and political trend, the proportion of handicapped children who receive education in separate schools, while small, has remained relatively constant.

However, data on this small yet important population are limited. The only source of national information comparable across disability groups is the OSEP State-reported data. As previously stated, these reports provide limited information about the demographic characteristics of students in these

---

[6]This is a voluntary data collection effort, in which schools are not obligated to provide data.

[7]This survey, like the Annuals, relies on voluntary response for its data.

programs, the severity of their disabilities, the nature and purpose of the education which they receive, or the qualifications of persons who are providing their education. This problem is compounded by the marked variations in placement rates by age groups, States, and disability status and the apparent year-to-year fluctuations in student classifications. Given these critical limitations with the existing data, one important goal of this study was to provide an accurate current description of the placement and educational experiences of students with handicaps in separate facilities and to develop a replicable design for periodic responses to the Congressional concern that programs of instruction for students in separate day and residential settings be examined. A second goal was to determine the extent to which and how the educational programs for handicapped students in separate facilities have changed, and to examine how policy efforts at the Federal, State, and local levels have influenced the observed changes. The next chapter reviews the study goals in greater detail and describes the research approaches designed to meet these goals.

II. STUDY DESIGN AND PRODUCTS

The Study of Programs of Instruction for Handicapped Children and Youth in Day and Residential Facilities addressed four sets of research questions:

1. **What are the current number and characteristics of separate facilities?** What are the characteristics of such facilities (e.g., their size, population, and administrative structure)? What is their mission and role? How many and what types of children enter and leave such facilities?

2. **What types of educational opportunities and related services do children who are placed in separate facilities receive?** What are the format and content of the educational programs? To what extent are parents involved in the program? What are the credentials and professional backgrounds of staff? What is the nature of integration opportunities available? What do facility administrators see as factors affecting the quality of their programs?

3. **What have been the patterns of change in separate facilities for handicapped children?** How have the student populations of separate day and residential facilities changed in recent years? Have the facilities changed in terms of their role and mission, administrative structure, or staffing?

4. **What factors have affected the practices of facilities and patterns of change?** What impact do State procedures (such as monitoring, technical assistance, training, and program development) have on the practices of facilities? What other factors (such as changes in the student population, financial constraints or incentives, or the practices of other State agencies or local education agencies) have influenced facility practices and patterns of change?

A. COMPONENTS OF STUDY DESIGN

The study design for this project was developed through consultation with an Advisory Board representing the interests of students in separate facilities and with staff of the U.S. Department of Education, within the

context of the legislative mandate. Through this process, the following design was recommended to address each of the above research questions:

- A survey of separate day and residential facilities, to provide nationally representative estimates of the current status of education afforded to handicapped children and youth in these facilities and to obtain retrospective reports of change
- A comparison of current survey results with certain findings from the 1978-79 OCR survey for those facilities surveyed in both, to describe changes in the population and services of those facilities
- A survey of all fifty States on the procedures used by the State education agencies to affect educational services at separate day and residential facilities, to describe the procedures currently in use
- Case studies of selected States and of separate facilities within the case study States, to describe the influence of State procedures on facility practices and to identify the influence of other factors on separate facilities

The Survey of Separate Facilities obtained data from facility administrators on a broad range of types of separate facilities, both public and private, serving all handicapping conditions. It provided the first national data set that permits statistically defensible and precise estimates of the current state of education in separate facilities serving handicapped children. In addition, some information was collected that allowed changes in facility programs and student populations to be measured relative to the results of an earlier study conducted in 1978-79 by the Office of Civil Rights; other information in the Survey of Separate Facilities asked for estimates of change from current staff. These data provide an opportunity to examine in broad terms the effects of shifts in public policy toward educating handicapped children.

However, in and of themselves, the survey data are not appropriate to examine whether and how State and local education agency procedures have influenced the programs of instruction provided at separate facilities. This question requires establishing temporal and causal links between the actions of the appropriate government agencies and the educational practices at the facilities. The case study component of the project was designed to provide detailed, in-depth information on State procedures to improve instruction for handicapped children in separate facilities and on facility responses to State education agency procedures and practices. The case studies also examined how local education agency procedures and practices as well as other factors influenced facility programs.

Case studies were conducted at two levels: (1) the level of the State education agency (SEA) and (2) the level of facilities within the State. Taken together, the State-level case studies and the case studies of facilities within each State were used to address specific research questions underlying the case study component of the study:

1. What procedures are used by State education agencies to influence special education programs at separate facilities?

2. What is the perceived and/or experienced effect of State procedures on special education programs at separate facilities?

3. What accounts for variations in the effectiveness of State procedures, and what other factors affect special education programs at separate facilities?

The dimensions of special education programs examined in this study were those which are the focus of and/or are susceptible to policy interventions, particularly at the State level. Such dimensions include staffing,

instructional approaches, delivery of program services (including opportunities for integration), and accountability (such as planning and assessment at the student level and program evaluation).

States have available a number of types of procedures to attempt to improve special education programs and instructional practices and ultimately the education provided to handicapped students in separate facilities (as well as that provided in other settings). These procedures include:

- Funding (the level and distribution of entitlement and discretionary or special-purpose grants)
- Standards (in such areas as staff certification, student-staff ratios, class size, curricula or graduation requirements)
- Monitoring (in terms of content or focus, preparation and follow-up activities, and sanctions or assistance associated with SEA review of facility records and procedures)
- Technical assistance and training (via seminars or workshops and consultation with individual facilities)
- Program development and dissemination (development, adaptation, and/or the distribution of curricula, instructional materials, procedural manuals, or information on state-of-the-art practices)

These SEA procedures are embedded within the larger entire special education system, which includes not only local education agencies and intermediate education units but also other State agencies and numerous non-governmental groups and organizations. This study focused primarily on the elements of the system and paths of influence directly linking the SEA organization and procedures with facility practices. Other elements of the special education system were explored as they related to the educational programs at separate facilities.

B. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF STUDY DESIGN

Based on the design outlined above, the study produced nationally representative data across the broad spectrum of separate facilities (day and residential, public and private, and those providing services to all handicap groups). Compared with the statistics on separate school placements reported by the States to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, the Survey of Separate Facilities was conducted directly at the facility level, and facility administrators were given detailed definitions of primary and secondary handicapping conditions that differed from those used by the U.S. Department of Education. Additional diagnostic categories were also provided to the respondents on the survey. Facility administrators were also not limited in their reports to students placed at the facility by the actions of a local school district or supported with State or Federal special education funding.

The data from the Survey of Separate Facilities made available for the first time a comprehensive national profile of programs, services, and activities at separate facilities, as well as of their students, staff, and administrative characteristics. These data provide a detailed quantitative benchmark against which future data can be compared. Changes at separate facilities in operation since the implementation of P.L. 94-142 were estimated and described, based both on a comparison with the 1978-79 OCR Survey of Special Purpose Facilities and on retrospective reports. The study also provides national data on the procedures used by the special education divisions of State education agencies that can affect educational practices at separate facilities. The case study components of the study were used to

expand on the information provided in the national facility and State surveys by providing more detailed examples and a dynamic perspective on change and the factors affecting change at separate facilities.

All study designs impose limitations on the questions that can be addressed. The limitations in this study come from the following aspects of the design:

- The use of the facility (rather than the student, for example) as the sampling unit and the unit of observation
- The focus solely on facilities that are defined as separate or self-contained (serving primarily or exclusively handicapped persons)
- The limited ability to measure change in facility characteristics
- The small number of case studies conducted

Volumes II and III provide greater detail on the elements of the study design, their limitations and implementation.

1. The Facility as the Unit of Sampling and Observation

Using the facility as the sampling unit and the unit of observation limits the types of issues that can be addressed. Even though some of the estimates produced from the Survey of Separate Facilities focus on students (for example, estimates of the numbers of students with various handicapping conditions who are served in various types of separate facilities), many issues pertaining to these students cannot be addressed because aggregate-level (that is, facility-level) data were collected.

No data were collected at the individual level on students at any time during this study. Thus, it is not possible to address whether out-of-home placement or particular patterns of services are appropriate for students in separate facilities, because the detailed data at the individual-student level

are not available. Further, facilities were not asked to associate the characteristics of individual children with the particular placements and services for those individual children. Thus, any research questions that focus on the association of variables at the individual-student level cannot be addressed in this study.

Similarly, the primary focus of the case study effort was to examine the link between State education agencies and separate facilities. Again, the unit of analysis was the facility and its educational practices. The underlying goal of the case study component of the study was to identify and describe how SEAs had been able to use various State-level procedures to influence changes in the educational practices of separate facilities. The purpose of this study was to examine the basic processes of change at the facility level. Later studies could be conducted which build on this groundwork, such as an examination of changes in the procedures by which students are identified, evaluated, and placed in separate facilities; analyses of changes in the educational processes at separate facilities that are designed to meet the unique needs of students placed there; and an assessment of the quality of instruction at separate facilities and changes in quality as indicated by student outcomes.

2. Focus on Separate Facilities

All of the facilities surveyed in this study were separate or self-contained facilities. This study was not intended to collect data on children placed in special classrooms or resource rooms within regular schools. Therefore, it is not possible within the scope of this study to assess how the educational services, instructional staff, the frequency and types of

interactions with nonhandicapped peers, or other aspects of the educational experience differ for children in separate facilities compared with those in special classrooms within regular schools. Similarly, since no comparable information on the physical environment, staff background, or related services available in regular schools was collected, it is not possible to assess how the services provided in separate day or residential facilities complement or duplicate those in the regular school environment.

3. Measuring Change

An important goal of this study was to measure and analyze the changes that have occurred in separate facilities since the passage of P.L. 94-142. While the 1978-79 OCR Directory of Special Purpose Facilities provides a useful benchmark for measuring change, it included only a portion of the full universe of all separate day and residential facilities in existence at that time. In particular, the study focuses on State-operated or supported facilities. Thus, many facilities of interest--in particular, locally operated or private facilities--are not covered by the 1978-79 data. This limits the ability to measure change across all types of facilities.

To compensate for information not collected by the OCR study, the Survey of Separate Facilities collected some retrospective data. Respondents in facilities in existence since 1976 were asked to provide some basic data on the facility at that time--the numbers and characteristics (age and severity of impairment) of the students served, and the number of instructional staff, if any--and to indicate whether certain qualitative changes in facility practice had taken place. While these data permit a description of changes for all facilities currently in operation, retrospective data have some

measurement problems, since they rely on the knowledge and accurate reporting of past characteristics by current staff.

4. Small Number of Case Studies

The case study approach was designed to provide an opportunity for a more detailed study of the processes by which facilities change and by which public policies at the State and local levels can affect facilities. Statements about the relationship between the procedures implemented by State education agencies and the characteristics and operations of separate facilities were developed from the case studies to help explicate the descriptive analyses of quantitative data from the Survey of Separate Facilities.

Since a limited number of case study sites (8 States and 24 facilities) were included in the study for the above purpose, only a fraction of the considerable variation across States and facilities was captured. By the nature of their selection, case study sites are not statistically representative of all States or separate facilities. However, they were selected based on hypotheses about critical variables affecting the relationship between SEA procedures and educational facility practices.

C. DATA COLLECTION RESULTS AND STUDY PRODUCTS

Detailed discussions of the sampling and data collection methodologies for the surveys and the case studies are contained in the companion volumes of this report. Volume II provides a description of these methodologies for the national Survey of Separate Facilities, while the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions is described in Volume III. Volume IV contains the instruments for both surveys. Volume III also provides a detailed discussion

of the selection of case study States and facilities and of the case study procedures. This overview briefly reviews the results of these data collection efforts and summarizes the content of the other volumes of the final report.

1. Summary of Data Collection Results

The data base for the Survey of Separate Facilities includes the 1,941 facilities responding either by mail to the full survey instrument or by telephone to an abbreviated instrument. These respondents represented 75 percent of the sample of 2,580 facilities identified as providing special education services in a setting physically separate from the educational services provided to nonhandicapped students. Most of the responding facilities took part in the survey during the fall of 1988 and provided information pertaining to the 1987-88 school year, although a few responded during the pilot survey conducted in the fall of 1987. More facilities responded by telephone than by mail (1,069 to 872, respectively). Weights were applied during the analysis to take into account differences across facilities in both sampling and response rates.

All but one State responded to the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions. The District of Columbia was also included in the survey, which was conducted during the second half of 1988 and requested information pertaining to the 1987-88 school year. Eight States also participated in the case study effort: California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, New Jersey, Ohio, and South Carolina. The case study site visits were conducted between June and October of 1987. Within each case study State, three separate facilities were selected, distributed among various types of

facilities of particular interest. Under the sample plan, nine State-operated facilities, ten facilities operated by local education agencies (LEAs), Intermediate Education Units (IEUs), or regional or county agencies, and five private facilities were selected.

- Of the facilities selected, half were residential, and half operated day programs only.
- The 24 facilities were distributed so that 10 visits were conducted at facilities for mentally retarded students, 10 at facilities for emotionally disturbed students, and 4 at facilities for sensory impaired students[1]
- Within the State-operated facilities for sensory impaired children selected for study, two are operated by the SEA and two as independent State agencies

Site visits at the twenty-four facilities were conducted between March and June of 1988.

2. Organization of Report

The remainder of Volume I provides an extended summary of the findings of the study, organized into three main sections: (1) a national profile of separate facilities, (2) a review of State special education procedures that can influence separate facilities, and (3) an analysis of changes at separate facilities since 1975 and the factors associated with those changes. A final section provides a brief overall summary and describes topics for a continuing research agenda on separate facilities.

[1]Because relatively few separate facilities for sensory impaired students are operated by local education agencies or private organizations, no such facilities were selected for the case study.

III. A NATIONAL PROFILE OF SEPARATE FACILITIES PROVIDING SPECIAL EDUCATION TO STUDENTS WITH HANDICAPS

The Survey of Separate Facilities was used to estimate the number of such facilities and the number of students served at such facilities,[1] for the nation as a whole and for subgroups defined by type of program (day or residential), type of operator (public or private), and handicapping condition of the students. Detailed analyses of student characteristics, student movement into and out of the facilities, educational programs and other activities provided to students, staffing patterns, and educational costs and other administrative characteristics of the facilities were also conducted. Given major differences in the nature of facility programs between day and residential separate facilities, this distinction was used throughout the analyses.

A. NUMBER OF SEPARATE FACILITIES AND STUDENTS

A total of 3,889 separate facilities were estimated to be in operation during the 1987-88 school year, serving a total of 384,051 handicapped students (see Tables III.1 and III.2). The population of separate facilities was almost evenly divided between publicly and privately operated programs

[1]These estimates are for the universe of students with handicaps at separate facilities, some of whom have Individual Education Programs (IEPs) and are funded with public special education monies, some of whom may be eligible but have not applied for publicly supported special education services, and others of whom would not be considered eligible for such services.

Table III.1

Estimated Number and Distribution of Separate Schools by Primary Disability Served by Facility and Operating Agency

Operating Agency	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
State Education Agency	-	23	35	*	26	*	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	109
Local Education Agency	47	237	222	224	*	0	43	*	*	*	160	0	21	1,004
Regional Agency, Consortium of School Districts, Intermediate Education Agency (IEU)	*	121	139	78	*	*	*	0	*	21	42	0	23	466
Other Public Agency	*	*	160	115	*	*	45	*	*	*	28	0	*	399
Total public	59	395	554	424	68	22	100	*	23	44	235	0	45	1,977
PRIVATE														
Private For-profit Corporation	24	*	40	121	0	*	0	0	*	*	*	0	0	211
Religious Organization	*	*	*	38	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	82
Other Private Not-for-profit Organization	155	188	173	667	27	*	71	*	37	44	173	*	48	1,605
Total private	193	208	226	829	31	*	71	*	39	46	197	*	50	1,911
TOTAL NUMBER OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS	252	602	781	1,253	98	33	171	19	62	90	432	*	95	3,889

Notes.
The primary disability served by a facility was the handicapping condition listed as the primary diagnosis for the largest number of students served by that facility. Students with mental retardation for whom level of retardation was not reported were classified as "mild/moderate" if the facility also served children with learning disabilities or emotional disturbance; otherwise as "severe/profound." Students who were indicated to be "multiply handicapped" but whose multiple conditions included both deafness and blindness were re-classified as "deaf-blind." Entries may not sum to totals due to rounding weighted data.
*Indicates cells where coefficient of variation is greater than .30, that is, conventional standards indicate that estimates are insufficiently precise to be interpreted. For estimates equal to zero, no standard errors can be calculated using standard methods.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.2

Distribution of Separate School Students by Primary Disability of Students and Operating Agency
(Number of Students Age 0-21)

Operating Agency	Primary Disability of Student													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
State Education Agency	*	*	4,149	1,045	3,536	1,094	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	11,659
Local Education Agency	5,491	22,838	23,715	19,915	1,892	*	5,211	1,315	2,674	1,865	18,568	*	1,513	105,547
Regional Agency, Consortium of School Districts, Intermediate Education Agency (IEU)	2,096	12,243	12,107	7,639	1,323	*	1,268	*	1,372	1,676	5,381	*	1,270	47,391
Other Public Agency	*	1,285	7,992	11,657	3,419	954	1,473	*	*	1,315	1,960	*	*	31,760
Total public	7,945	37,020	47,964	40,257	10,170	3,015	8,042	2,344	4,528	4,865	26,608	*	3,329	196,357
PRIVATE														
Individual, Partnership, Family Operated	*	*	*	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	*	1,030
Private For-profit Corporation	1,605	*	1,393	12,131	*	*	*	*	*	*	1,229	*	0	17,242
Religious Organization	967	1,097	846	2,155	*	*	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	5,875
Other Private Not-for-profit Organization	13,054	9,701	7,989	38,668	4,080	889	5,348	1,485	3,275	3,402	11,214	*	4,398	103,547
Total private	15,862	10,975	10,368	53,205	4,565	914	5,472	1,539	3,630	3,688	12,889	*	4,537	127,694
TOTAL NUMBER OF SEPARATE SCHOOL STUDENTS	23,809	47,995	58,332	93,462	14,735	3,929	13,514	3,884	8,158	8,551	39,497	*	7,866	324,051

Notes.
Columns and rows may not sum to totals due to rounding weighted data.
Students with mental retardation for whom level of retardation was not reported were classified as "mild/moderate" if the facility also served students with learning disabilities or emotional disturbance; otherwise they were classified as "severe/profound." Students who were both deaf and blind were considered to have these as their primary diagnoses even if listed on the "multiple handicap" report form that did not differentiate primary from secondary diagnosis. Students who were indicated to be "multiply handicapped" but whose multiple conditions included both deafness and blindness were re-classified as "deaf-blind."
"Autism" includes diagnoses of autism or of "pervasive developmental disorder" within the general diagnostic category of emotional disturbance. Entries may not sum to totals due to rounding weighted data.
*Indicates cells where coefficient of variation is greater than .30, that is, conventional standards indicate that estimates are insufficiently precise to be interpreted. For estimates equal to zero, no standard errors can be calculated using standard methods.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

(1,977 and 1,911, respectively).[2] However, there were an estimated 196,357 students in public separate facilities, compared with 127,694 in private facilities. There were 2,639 public and private separate day facilities serving a total of 228,716 students, compared with 1,250 residential facilities with 95,335 students. The estimated average size of separate day schools was 99 students, ages 0 through 21 years. Publicly operated separate day schools averaged 113 students; private schools averaged 79 students. The estimated average size of separate residential schools was 113 students, ages 0 through 21 years. Publicly operated separate residential schools were on average much larger than private ones: 202 students and 75 students, respectively.

Tables III.3 through III.6 present the estimated number of facilities and students separately for day and residential programs, and include detailed distributions of these facilities and students across type of public or private operator and by the handicapping condition of the majority of students served at each facility (primary disability served by the facility). Tables III.7 and III.8 present the estimated number of students with each handicapping condition separately for day and residential programs, and show detailed distributions of these students across type of public or private operator.

An estimated 2,639 separate day schools serving students with handicaps ages 0 through 21 years were operating in 1988. An estimated 59 percent of separate day schools were publicly operated; 35 percent were operated by

---

[2]Note that, because the estimates were based on weighted data, entries may not sum to totals due to rounding.

Table III.3

Estimated Number and Distribution of Separate Day Schools by Primary Disability Served by Facility and Operating Agency

Operating Agency	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
State Education Agency	0	22	28	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	55
Local Education Agency	47	219	203	195	*	0	39	*	*	*	156	0	21	928
Regional Agency, Consortium of School Districts, Intermediate Education Agency (IEU)	*	121	125	72	*	0	*	0	*	21	42	0	23	441
Other Public Agency	*	*	25	34	*	0	43	*	0	*	*	0	*	124
Total public	59	369	380	300	23	0	94	*	*	44	206	0	43	1,548
PRIVATE														
Private For-profit Corporation	22	*	*	38	0	*	0	0	*	*	*	0	0	77
Religious Organization	*	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	*	0	0	38
Other Private Not-for-profit Organization	127	135	123	265	*	*	62	*	27	39	119	0	43	964
Total private	163	147	130	314	*	*	62	*	29	41	135	0	45	1,091
TOTAL NUMBER OF DAY SCHOOLS	222	516	510	614	35	*	156	*	48	85	341	0	90	2,639

Notes.
The primary disability served by a facility was the handicapping condition listed as the primary diagnosis for the largest number of students served by that facility. Students with mental retardation for whom level of retardation was not reported were classified as "mild/moderate" if the facility also served children with learning disabilities or emotional disturbance; otherwise as "severe/profound." Students who were indicated to be "multiply handicapped" but whose multiple conditions included both deafness and blindness were re-classified as "deaf-blind." Entries may not sum to totals due to rounding weighted data.
*Indicates cells where coefficient of variation is greater than .30, that is, conventional standards indicate that estimates are insufficiently precise to be interpreted. For estimates equal to zero, no standard errors can be calculated using standard methods.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.4

Estimated Number and Distribution of Separate Residential Schools by Primary Disability Served by Facility and Operating Agency

Operating Agency	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
State Education Agency	0	*	*	*	23	*	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	54
Local Education Agency	0	*	*	29	*	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	76
Regional Agency, Consortium of School Districts, Intermediate Education Agency (IEU)	0	0	*	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Other Public Agency	0	*	135	81	*	*	*	0	*	0	23	0	0	275
Total public	0	26	174	124	45	22	*	0	*	0	29	0	0	429
PRIVATE														
Private For-profit Corporation	*	*	39	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	134
Religious Organization	0	*	*	30	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Other Private Not-for-profit Organization	28	53	50	402	*	*	*	*	*	*	54	*	*	641
Total private	30	61	96	515	*	*	*	*	*	*	62	*	*	820
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS	30	86	271	639	63	25	*	*	*	*	91	*	*	1,250

Notes.
The primary disability served by a facility was the handicapping condition listed as the primary diagnosis for the largest number of students served by that facility. Students with mental retardation for whom level of retardation was not reported were classified as "mild/moderate" if the facility also served children with learning disabilities or emotional disturbance; otherwise as "severe/profound." Students who were indicated to be "multiply handicapped" but whose multiple conditions included both deafness and blindness were re-classified as "deaf-blind." Entries may not sum to totals due to rounding weighted data.
*Indicates cells where coefficient of variation is greater than .30, that is, conventional standards indicate that estimates are insufficiently precise to be interpreted. For estimates equal to zero, no standard errors can be calculated using standard methods.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.5

Estimated Number and Distribution of Separate Day School Students by Primary Disability Served by Facility and Operating Agency
(Number of Students Age 0-21)

Operating Agency	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
State Education Agency	0	*	3,438	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	4,514
Local Education Agency	7,071	25,633	22,029	16,582	1,171	0	4,486	*	884	1,900	17,796	0	1,819	100,161
Regional Agency, Consortium of School Districts, Intermediate Education Agency (IEU)	1,772	14,782	12,120	7,100	*	0	829	0	1,073	2,078	3,823	0	1,729	45,690
Other Public Agency	*	*	1,470	2,962	*	0	2,614	*	0	*	*	0	*	9,216
Total public	8,953	41,394	39,057	26,644	2,151	0	7,930	1,295	1,958	4,229	21,909	0	4,061	159,581
PRIVATE														
Individual, Partnership, Family Operated	*	0	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	*	1,029
Private For-profit Corporation	1,449	*	*	2,247	0	*	0	0	*	*	*	0	0	4,777
Religious Organization	828	915	*	*	0	*	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	2,624
Other Private Not-for-profit Organization	10,053	8,459	5,187	14,843	1,192	*	3,958	*	846	2,481	8,427	0	4,395	60,706
Total private	12,547	9,409	5,790	17,701	1,192	*	3,958	*	981	2,677	9,508	0	4,484	69,135
TOTAL NUMBER OF DAY SCHOOL STUDENTS	21,500	50,803 *	44,847	44,345	3,344	*	11,888	1,789	2,938	6,906	31,417	0	8,545	228,716

Notes:
The primary disability served by a facility was the handicapping condition listed as the primary diagnosis for the largest number of students served by that facility. Students with mental retardation for whom level of retardation was not reported were classified as "mild/moderate" if the facility also served children with learning disabilities or emotional disturbance; otherwise as "severe/profound." Students who were indicated to be "multiply handicapped" but whose multiple conditions included both deafness and blindness were re-classified as "deaf-blind." Entries may not sum to totals due to rounding weighted data.
*Indicates cells where coefficient of variation is greater than .30, that is, conventional standards indicate that estimates are insufficiently precise to be interpreted. For estimates equal to zero, no standard errors can be calculated using standard methods.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.6

Estimated Number and Distribution of Separate Residential School Students by Primary Disability Served by Facility and Operating Agency
(Number of Students Age 0-21)

Operating Agency	Primary Disability Served by the facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
State Education Agency	0	*	*	1,363	3,693	1,068	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	7,145
Local Education Agency	0	*	1,154	2,955	*	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	5,386
Regional Agency, Consortium of School Districts, Intermediate Education Agency (IEU)	0	0	*	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,701
Other Public Agency	0	*	6,894	9,245	3,316	837	*	0	0	0	1,365	0	0	22,544
Total public	0	960	9,202	13,771	7,988	2,267	*	0	*	0	2,002	0	0	36,776
PRIVATE														
Private for-profit Corporation	*	*	1,377	10,385	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	12,465
Religious Organization	0	*	*	2,018	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,251
Other Private Not-for-profit Organization	2,979	3,764	1,698	26,165	2,537	*	*	*	*	*	3,162	*	*	42,841
Total private	3,097	4,374	3,430	38,568	2,997	*	*	*	*	*	3,556	*	*	58,559
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL STUDENTS	3,097	5,334	12,631	52,339	10,986	2,649	941	*	*	*	5,559	*	*	95,335

Notes:
The primary disability served by a facility was the handicapping condition listed as the primary diagnosis for the largest number of students served by that facility. Students with mental retardation for whom level of retardation was not reported were classified as "mild/moderate" if the facility also served children with learning disabilities or emotional disturbance; otherwise as "severe/profound." Students who were indicated to be "multiply handicapped" but whose multiple conditions included both deafness and blindness were re-classified as "deaf-blind." Entries may not sum to totals due to rounding weighted data.
*Indicates cells where coefficient of variation is greater than .30, that is, conventional standards indicate that estimates are insufficiently precise to be interpreted. For estimates equal to zero, no standard errors can be calculated using standard methods.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.7

Distribution of Separate Day School Students by Primary Disability of Students and Operating Agency
(Number of Students Age 0-21)

Operating Agency	Primary Disability of Student: Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism[a]	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
State Education Agency	*	*	3,260	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	4,514
Local Education Agency	5,450	22,312	22,638	17,240	1,669	*	5,060	1,315	2,393	1,865	18,155	*	1,513	100,161
Regional Agency, Consortium of School Districts, Intermediate Education Agency (IEU)	2,096	12,202	11,865	7,441	807	*	1,268	*	1,361	1,676	5,009	*	1,270	45,690
Other Public Agency	*	*	1,436	3,083	*	*	1,109	*	*	1,284	*	0	*	9,216
Total public	7,702	35,431	39,198	27,830	3,039	*	7,526	2,341	3,896	4,826	23,890	*	3,078	159,581
PRIVATE														
Individual, Partnership, Family Operated	*	0	*	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	*	1,029
Private For-profit Corporation	1,409	*	*	2,216	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	4,777
Religious Organization	*	817	*	*	0	0	0	0	*	*	*	0	*	2,624
Other Private Not-for-profit Organization	10,030	7,115	5,871	13,535	1,497	*	4,615	1,141	1,672	2,783	7,843	*	4,118	60,706
Total private	12,421	8,002	6,525	16,355	1,517	*	4,705	1,148	1,811	3,044	8,859	*	4,235	69,135
TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS AGE 0-21 (from 1988 survey results)	20,124	43,433	45,723	44,185	4,556	1,189	12,231	3,489	5,707	7,869	32,749	*	7,312	228,716
TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS AGE 3-21 (from OSEP State-reported data for 1986-87) [b]														
Public	22,252	59,291	26,557	3,478	661	5,321	2,130	a	9,145	13,170	244	NA	142,217	
Private	9,572	13,326	18,110	2,378	649	2,206	1,186	a	16,062	7,457	71	NA	70,983	
Total	31,824	72,617	44,667	5,856	1,310	7,527	3,316	a	25,207	20,627	315	NA	213,200	

Notes.
Students with mental retardation for whom level of retardation was not reported were classified as "mild/moderate" if the facility also served students with learning disabilities or emotional disturbance; otherwise they were classified as "severe/profound." Students who were both deaf and blind were considered to have these as their primary diagnoses even if listed on the "multiple handicap" report form that did not differentiate primary from secondary diagnosis. Students who were indicated to be "multiply handicapped" but whose multiple conditions included both deafness and blindness were re-classified as "deaf-blind." "Autism" includes diagnoses of autism or of "pervasive developmental disorder" within the general diagnostic category of emotional disturbance. Entries may not sum to totals due to rounding weighted data.
*Indicates cells where coefficient of variation is greater than .30, that is, conventional standards indicate that estimates are insufficiently precise to be interpreted. For estimates equal to zero, no standard errors can be calculated using standard methods.
NA = not applicable.
[a] Autism is included with other health impairments under U.S. Department of Education definitions.
[b] U.S. Department of Education, 1989.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

55

Table III.8

Distribution of Separate Residential School Students by Primary Disability of Students and Operating Agency
(Number of Students Age 0-21)

Operating Agency	Primary Disability of Student													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism[a]	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
State Education Agency	*	*	889	980	3,294	1,089	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	7,145
Local Education Agency	*	*	1,077	2,675	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	0	5,386
Regional Agency, Consortium of School Districts, Intermediate Education Agency (IEU)	0	*	*	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	0	0	1,701
Other Public Agency	*	903	6,558	8,574	3,098	896	*	*	*	*	1,492	*	*	22,544
Total public	*	1,589	8,766	12,427	7,131	2,306	*	*	*	*	2,718	*	*	36,776
PRIVATE														
Private For-profit Corporation	*	*	1,383	9,915	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	12,465
Religious Organization	*	*	*	1,802	*	*	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	3,251
Other Private Not-for-profit Organization	3,024	2,586	2,118	25,133	2,583	*	*	*	1,603	*	3,371	*	*	42,841
Total private	3,461	2,973	3,843	36,850	3,048	*	*	*	1,819	*	4,030	*	*	58,559
TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS AGE 0-21 (from survey results)	3,685	4,562	12,609	49,277	10,179	2,740	1,283	*	2,451	*	6,748	*	*	95,335
TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS AGE 3-21 (from OSEP State-reported data for 1986-87) [b]														
Public	627	4,642		6,163	6,070	2,260	274	264	a	274	2,874	393	NA	23,793
Private	1,026	2,538		8,430	693	290	275	368	a	336	1,399	96	NA	15,494
Total	1,653	7,180		14,593	6,763	2,550	549	632	a	610	4,273	489	NA	39,287

Notes.
Students with mental retardation for whom level of retardation was not reported were classified as "mild/moderate" if the facility also served students with learning disabilities or emotional disturbance; otherwise they were classified as "severe/profound." Students who were both deaf and blind were considered to have these as their primary diagnoses even if listed on the "multiple handicap" report form that did not differentiate primary from secondary diagnosis. Students who were indicated to be "multiply handicapped" but whose multiple conditions included both deafness and blindness were re-classified as "deaf-blind." "Autism" includes diagnoses of autism or of "pervasive developmental disorder" within the general diagnostic category of emotional disturbance. *Indicates cells where coefficient of variation is greater than .30, that is, conventional standards indicate that estimates are insufficiently precise to be interpreted. For estimates equal to zero, no standard errors can be calculated using standard methods.
NA = not applicable.
[a] Autism is included with other health impairments under U.S. Department of Education definitions.
[b] U.S. Department of Education, 1989.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

local education agencies (LEAs). Three-quarters (75 percent) of separate day schools primarily served students with mental retardation (39 percent), emotional disturbance (23 percent), or multiple handicaps (13 percent).

Residential schools were defined as residential settings in which students were educated on the grounds of the facility. Often, residential institutions were residential schools by definition, since an educational program was provided on grounds, even though placements in the facility were not generally for the primary purpose of receiving an educational program. An estimated 1,250 separate residential schools serving students with handicaps ages 0 through 21 years were operating in 1988. An estimated two-thirds of these schools (66 percent) were privately operated--just over three-quarters of these (78 percent) by non-religious nonprofit organizations. About half of all separate residential schools (an estimated 51 percent) primarily served students with emotional disturbance. An estimated 63 percent of all private residential schools primarily served students with emotional disturbance.

In all, the Survey of Separate Facilities estimated that there were 228,716 children and youth with handicaps in separate day schools in 1988. This compares with a total of 213,200 students reported for the 1986-87 school year in the 1989 Report to Congress (Office of Special Education Programs, 1989).[3] As noted in Chapter II, for a number of reasons,[4] these two reports

---

[3]Note that the State reports for specific handicapping conditions do not always sum to the total number of students across all conditions. The discussion of State-reported OSEP data in this report relies on the data available by handicapping condition.

[4]These included the fact that the State reports were for the 1986-87 school year, one year prior to the Survey of Separate Facilities, and included only students ages 3 through 21, whereas the survey asked for information on students birth through 21.

were not expected to be identical. The differences between the survey estimates and the State-reported statistics were less than 7 percent for the total number of separate day school students, about 12 percent for total public day school students, and about 3 percent for total private day school students. Somewhat greater variability was found by students' primary handicapping condition. The survey estimates were larger than the State-reported data for multiply handicapped and orthopedically impaired students, while more speech impaired and learning disabled students were reported by the States than in the survey estimates.[5]

In terms of residential school placements, the difference between the 1986-87 OSEP State-reported data and the survey estimates is large (39,287 and 95,335 residential school students, respectively). In addition to the factors noted in the discussion above, differences between the two data sources may due to the inclusion of day students at residential facilities in the residential facility student estimates derived from the survey. Also, the statistics from the State reports do not include the category of homebound or hospital environment. It is believed that an unknown number of students

---

[5]There are differences between independent published statistics for schools for hearing impaired students and the survey results. The 1989 American Annals of the Deaf reported 51 public and private day schools (including full-time private day classes) in operation as of October 1, 1988, serving 4,056 hearing impaired students. However, given the way in which schools were characterized in the Survey of Separate Facilities (that is, by the primary handicapping condition of the majority of students served), as well as other differ-ences in how the American Annals data were collected and categorized, it is not clear to what extent the estimates of 35 day facilities serving 3,344 students represents an underestimate of the hearing impaired population of separate day facilities. When all separate day facilities are included, regardless of primary disability served, an estimate of 4,556 day school students with hearing impairment as the primary handicapping condition was obtained from the survey data.

reported by the State in this category reside in separate facilities included in the survey, which included hospitals and treatment settings with average lengths of stay of at least 30 days.

About 34,700 of the total difference of about 56,000 (62 percent of the difference) between the two statistics on the number of handicapped students in residential facilities can be attributed to the difference in the statistics on residential schools for students with emotional disturbance. While States reported 14,593 students with emotional disturbance in residential school programs receiving Federal special education funds, the estimates based on facility reports indicated 49,277 students with emotional disturbance. To some extent this difference may reflect the fact that the placement of children and youth with emotional or behavior problems in residential settings is often initiated for reasons other than educational. As noted frequently by State education agency officials in the case study component of this project, such placement decisions are often made by parents and other public or private agency representatives in response to behavior patterns, episodes, and other problems considered to be of more immediate, short-term concern than chronic conditions which affect educational performance. In some cases, no public special education funds may be used for these placements, particularly if made by the family rather than by a public agency, and many of the students placed in residential treatment programs may not previously have been identified as having special education needs. These factors may also explain the difference between the survey estimate of 3,685

students with learning disabilities in residential schools and the 1,653 reported in the State placement statistics.

The survey also identified almost 10,000 more students with mental retardation in separate residential facilities than were reported by the States, accounting for another 18 percent of the total difference between the two sets of data. This difference between State reports and survey estimates of the number of mentally retarded students in separate residential facilities is even greater if students with multiple handicaps (an estimated 96 percent of wnom have mental retardation as one of their handicapping conditions) are combined with those with mental retardation. When combined in this way, the State-reported placement data indicated 11,453 students with mental retardation or multiple handicaps, while the facility survey estimated 23,919, a difference of about 12,500. There were a reported 3,541 students with mental retardation and 1,204 students with multiple handicaps reported by the States in hospital or homebound programs. Some of these students may have been participating in such programs while at residential institutions, which would potentially reduce the difference between the survey estimates and State reports of mentally retarded and multiply handicapped students in separate residential facilities by about 4,700. However, data are not available to determine the proportion of these 4,700 students who actually were residing in separate facilities eligible for the survey.

Based on data from the Survey of Separate Facilities, students with mental retardation were estimated to comprise 39 percent of all separate day school students, with another 13 percent accounted for by students with

multiple handicaps, one of which being mental retardation. These groups together accounted for more than half (about 52 percent, or 121,905) of the total 228,716 separate day school students. Students with a primary diagnosis of emotional disturbance were estimated to comprise 19 percent of all separate day school students and 52 percent of all separate residential school students. An estimated 23,919 residential school students (25 percent) had either a primary diagnosis of mental retardation or were indicated to be multiply handicapped, with one of the multiple conditions being mental retardation.

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS

1. Severity of Handicapping Condition and Secondary Disabilities

Tables III.9 and III.10 present the distribution of students at separate day and residential facilities by the type or severity of their primary handicapping condition. As noted later (see Table III.11), substantial proportions of students with various primary handicapping conditions have secondary disabilities as well.

The largest category of day school students were those with mental retardation (39 percent of the total). About 5 percent of all day school students had mild mental retardation, about 15 percent had moderate mental retardation, about 11 percent had severe mental retardation, and about 8 percent had profound mental retardation. In addition, about 6 percent of students in separate day schools were reported to be multiply handicapped, but with mild or moderate mental retardation as one of their conditions, and about 7 percent of students in day schools were reported to be multiply handicapped, with severe or profound mental retardation as one of their conditions. Nearly

Table III.9

Distribution of Separate Day School Students by Type and/or Severity of Primary Handicapping Condition

Type and Degree of Primary Disability	Estimated Total Students	Percent of Students with Primary Condition	Percent in Public Facilities[a]	Percent in Private Facilities[a]	Percent of Total Day School Population[b] Age 0-21
LEARNING DISABLED	20,124				
Mild/Moderate Learning Disability		59.9	28.8	71.2	5.3
Severe Learning Disability		37.2	37.3	62.7	3.3
Other		2.9	17.5	82.5	0.3
MENTALLY RETARDED	89,156				
Mild Mental Retardation		13.0	71.3	28.7	5.1
Moderate Mental Retardation		38.4	84.5	15.5	15.0
Severe Mental Retardation		28.6	86.5	13.5	11.2
Profound Mental Retardation		20.1	86.8	13.2	7.9
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	44,185				
Attention Defect Disorder		17.4	52.3	47.7	3.4
Serious Conduct/Behavior Disorder		47.6	67.4	32.6	9.2
Anxiety or Withdrawal Disorder		9.8	52.7	47.3	1.9
Pervasive Developmental Disorder		5.8	51.6	48.4	1.1
Substance Abuse or Dependence		3.1	57.1	42.9	0.6
Psychotic or Schizophrenic Thought Disorders		7.2	59.9	40.1	1.4
Other Emotional/Behavior Disorder		9.2	58.0	42.0	1.8
HEARING IMPAIRMENT	4,556				
Prelingually Deaf					
Mild		5.1	*	*	0.1
Moderate		14.0	*	*	0.3
Severe		72.9	61.2	38.8	1.5
Postlingually Deaf					
Mild		0.2	*	*	<0.1
Moderate		1.1	*	*	<0.1
Severe		6.7	*	*	0.1
VISUAL IMPAIRMENT	1,189				
Functionally Blind		35.9	*	*	0.2
Legally (but not functionally) Blind		35.9	*	*	0.2
Partially Sighted		28.3	*	*	0.1
ORTHOPEDIC/PHYSICAL IMPAIRMENT	12,231				
Cerebral Palsy		55.6	61.4	38.6	3.0
Quadreplegia, Paraplegia or Hemiplegia		8.2	70.8	29.2	0.4
Missing/deformed limbs		1.6	*	*	0.1
Other nervous/musculoskeletal system disease		34.5	55.7	44.3	1.8
HEALTH IMPAIRMENT	3,489				
Respiratory Conditions		27.6	47.2	52.8	0.3
Circulatory Conditions		4.2	*	*	0.1
Other health impairments		68.4	69.3	30.7	1.0
AUTISM	5,707	100.0	66.1	33.9	2.5
SPEECH/LANGUAGE IMPAIRED	7,869				
Speech Impaired		53.0	65.1	34.9	1.8
Language Impaired		47.0	50.6	49.4	1.6
MULTIHANDICAPPED	32,749				
With mild/moderate retardation		45.2	78.4	21.6	6.4
With severe/profound retardation		48.1	72.2	27.8	6.9
Without mental retardation		6.7	41.8	58.2	1.0
DEAF-BLIND	149	100.0	*	*	<0.1
NONCATEGORICAL	7,312	100.0	45.4	54.6	3.2
TOTAL	228,716	100.0	69.8	30.2	100.0

Notes.
Rows and columns may not sum to 100% because of rounding.
Data for this table were provided for 96,025 of the 136,593 students (unweighted) with handicaps in schools making up the day school sample.
[a]These two percentages will sum to 100 percent within the row.
[b]These percentages will sum to 100 percent within the column.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.10

Distribution of Separate Residential School Students
by Type and/or Severity of Primary Handicapping Condition

Type and Degree of Primary Condition	Estimated Total Students	Percent of Students with Primary Conditions	Percent in Public Facilities[a]	Percent in Private Facilities[a]	Percent of Total Residential School Population[b]
LEARNING DISABLED	3,685				
Mild/Moderate Learning Disability		55.1	10.2	89.8	2.1
Severe Learning Disability		44.2	3.4	96.6	1.7
Other		0.6	*	*	<0.1
MENTALLY RETARDED	17,171				
Mild Mental Retardation		12.0	37.9	62.1	2.2
Moderate Mental Retardation		15.2	37.9	62.1	2.7
Severe Mental Retardation		23.2	55.9	44.1	4.2
Profound Mental Retardation		49.6	69.8	30.2	8.9
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	49,277				
Attention Defect Disorder		19.1	29.9	70.1	9.9
Serious Conduct/Behavior Disorder		43.7	25.8	74.2	22.6
Anxiety or Withdrawal Disorder		9.6	25.5	74.5	5.0
Pervasive Developmental Disorder		4.4	32.5	67.5	2.3
Substance Abuse or Dependence		6.4	16.2	83.8	3.3
Psychotic or Schizophrenic Thought Disorders		6.5	36.5	63.5	3.4
Other Emotional/Behavior Disorder		10.3	30.8	69.2	5.3
HEARING IMPAIRMENT	10,179				
Prelingually Deaf					
Mild		1.6	*	*	0.2
Moderate		6.3	*	*	0.6
Severe		85.5	71.6	28.4	9.1
Postlingually Deaf					
Mild		0.4	*	*	<0.1
Moderate		1.2	*	*	0.1
Severe		5.1	*	*	0.5
VISUAL IMPAIRMENT	2,740				
Functionally Blind		39.1	97.7	2.3	1.1
Legally (but not functionally) Blind		50.3	96.8	3.2	1.4
Partially Sighted		10.6	*	*	0.3
ORTHOPEDIC/PHYSICAL IMPAIRMENT	1,283				
Cerebral Palsy		52.5	*	*	0.7
Quadreplegia, Paraplegia or Hemiplegia		8.8	*	*	0.1
Missing/deformed limbs		3.2	*	*	<0.1
Other nervous/musculoskeletal system disease		35.5	*	*	0.5
HEALTH IMPAIRMENT	395				
Respiratory Conditions		*	*	*	<0.1
Circulatory Conditions		*	*	*	<0.1
Other health impairments		*	*	*	0.4
AUTISM	2,451	100.0	17.4	82.6	2.6
SPEECH/LANGUAGE IMPAIRED	682				
Speech Impaired		*	*	*	0.5
Language Impaired		*	*	*	0.3
MULTIHANDICAPPED	6,748				
With mild/moderate retardation		31.6	31.6	68.4	2.2
With severe/profound retardation		42.2	49.8	50.2	3.0
Without mental retardation		26.6	35.4	64.6	1.9
DEAF-BLIND	170	100.0	*	*	0.2
NONCATEGORICAL	554	100.0	*	*	0.6
TOTAL	95,335	100.0	38.6	61.4	100.0

Notes.
Rows and columns may not sum to 100% because of rounding.
Data for this table were provided for 39,355 of the 56,626 students (unweighted) with handicaps in the schools making up the residential school sample.
[a] These two percentages will sum to 100 percent within the row.
[b] These percentages will sum to 100 percent within the column.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

half (48 percent) of the estimated 19 percent of separate day school students reported as emotionally disturbed were classified as having serious conduct or behavior disorders. Students with learning disabilities, although comprising 47 percent of the total population of students ages 6 through 21 receiving special education services in 1987-88, comprised only an estimated 9 percent of the students in separate day schools.

As noted above, by far the largest group of residential facility students were those with emotional disturbance (52 percent). An estimated 23 percent of all residential school students were reported to have conduct or behavior disorders, as compared with 18 percent of residential school students reported to have mental retardation. About 11 percent of all residential school students had hearing impairments as a primary handicapping condition, with about .85 percent of these students having severe prelingual deafness. Students with learning disabilities comprised only about 4 percent of the residential school students.

Table III.11 indicates the percent of handicapped students in separate facilities who were reported to have no serious secondary disability, separately for day and residential facilities and by public or private operation and the primary handicapping condition of the student. Mentally retarded students at residential facilities were more likely to have a secondary disability than were mentally retarded students in separate day facilities, while the reverse was true for learning disabled and health impaired students. Within each type of program (day or residential) there were generally no large differences in the percent of students with no secondary disabilities between publicly and privately operated facilities.

TABLE III.11

PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT SEPARATE FACILITIES WITH NO SECONDARY DISABILITY, BY PRIMARY DISABILITY OF STUDENT AND BY PROGRAM TYPE AND OPERATING AGENCY

	Primary Disability of Student							
	Learning or Speech/Language Disability	Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism
DAY								
Public	53.1	47.6	66.4	50.8	*	40.2	46.8	40.0
Private	47.4	40.2	59.4	68.0	*	32.3	16.5	11.9
Total	49.9	46.3	64.4	56.7	26.8	37.4	35.6	31.4
RESIDENTIAL								
Public	*	32.2	74.2	61.3	56.0	*	0	*
Private	58.6	24.7	66.8	55.1	*	*	*	23.4
Total	60.7	29.2	67.9	59.1	46.8	61.0	*	21.3

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

* Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances using standards methods.

2. Demographic Characteristics

Tables III.12 and III.13 present detailed age distributions of students at separate day and residential facilities, by the primary disability of the students.

Most students in separate day schools (61 percent) were between the ages of 6 and 17 years, but about 23 percent were 5 years and younger, and about 16 percent were 18 years and older. Residential school students were markedly older on average than were day school students. Only about 8 percent of residential school students were 5 years or younger, compared with 23 percent of day school students. About 23 percent of residential school students were 18 through 21 years old, compared with 16 percent of the day school students.

Fifty-four percent of day school students with hearing impairments were 5 years old or younger, while one-third of residential school students with hearing impairments were 5 years old or younger. Students with mental retardation at separate day facilities were most likely to be 18 through 21 years (29 percent of all day school students with mental retardation), while more than half (51 percent) of residential school students with mental retardation were between the ages of 18 and 22.

Males comprised an estimated 64 percent of all day school students, including 66 percent of public school students and 62 percent of private school students at separate day facilities. At residential facilities, the proportion of students who were male was 65 percent; they comprised 59 percent of students at public facilities and 68 percent of students at private

Table III.12

Percent of Separate Day School Students by Age and Primary Disability of Student

Age of Student	Primary Disability of Student (Estimated Students 0-21 Years)									
	Learning or Speech/Language Disability (27,933)	Mental Retardation (89,156)	Emotional Disturbance (44,185)	Hearing Impairment (4,604)	Visual Impairment (1,258)	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment (12,231)	Health Impairment and Autism (9,196)	Multiple Handicap (32,782)	Non Categorical Disability (7,312)	All Disabilities (228,716)
0 - 2 Years of Age	7.1	6.5	0.6	9.6	*	24.0	*	9.7	32.0	6.9
3 - 5 Years of Age	32.4	13.7	11.8	44.6	*	35.3	*	19.0	61.2	16.3
6 - 11 Years of Age	27.7	20.6	25.4	27.5	*	18.6	*	29.4	*	25.3
12 - 17 Years of Age	28.5	30.0	53.6	13.5	*	*	*	29.7	*	35.3
18 - 21 Years of Age	4.4	29.4	8.6	4.8	*	*	*	12.3	*	16.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Notes.
Data for this table were reported by day schools with 52,135 of the 136,593 students (unweighted) in the day facility sample.
Students with speech or language problems are grouped with those who have learning disabilities. Students who have autism appear under the column heading "emotional disturbance" (pervasive developmental disorder [38% of unweighted cases of autism]), under "health impairments" (61%), or "multiple handicaps" (1%). Students who are both deaf and blind are included under "hearing impairment" (32%), "visual impairment" (46%), or "multiple handicaps" (22%).
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.1*

Percent of Separate Residential School Students by Age and Primary Disability of Student

Age of Student	Primary Disability of Student (Estimated Students 0-21 Years)									
	Learning or Speech/Language Disability (4,367)	Mental Retardation (17,171)	Emotional Disturbance (49,277)	Hearing Impairment (10,234)	Visual Impairment (2,818)	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment (1,283)	Health Impairment and Autism (2,846)	Multiple Handicap (6,785)	Non Categorical Disability (*)	All Disabilities (95,335)
0 - 2 Years of Age	0.8	2.6	1.1	1.3	0.5	*	6.6	10.5	*	2.5
3 - 5 Years of Age	8.0	4.9	5.8	31.3	4.1	*	16.8	14.0	*	5.3
6 - 11 Years of Age	16.4	12.0	19.2	22.3	22.4	*	30.8	27.8	*	19.4
12 - 17 Years of Age	65.7	29.6	66.4	30.3	47.4	*	20.0	32.4	*	50.0
18 - 21 Years of Age	9.1	51.0	7.5	14.9	25.6	*	25.8	15.2	*	22.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Notes.
Data for this table were reported by residential facilities with 21,330 of 56,626 students (unweighted) in the residential facility sample. Students with speech or language problems are grouped with those who have learning disabilities. Students who have autism appear under the column heading "emotional disturbance" (pervasive developmental disorder [38% of unweighted cases of autism]), under "health impairments" (61%), or "multiple handicaps" (1%). Students who are both deaf and blind are included under "hearing impairment" (32%), "visual impairment" (46%), or multiple handicaps (22%).
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

facilities. The proportion male in any category of separate facility did not vary substantially by students' handicapping conditions, except for day school students who were emotionally disturbed, of whom about 77 percent (81 percent of public day school students and 69 percent of private day school students with emotional disturbance) were male.

The racial/ethnic composition of separate day school population was comparable to the racial/ethnic composition of the school-age population in general.[6] Like the general population, white non-Hispanic students comprised 71 percent of the day school population. Black non-Hispanics comprised 15 percent of the school-age population and 19 percent of the estimated day school population. Students of Hispanic background comprised an estimated 7 percent of the day school population, compared with about 10.5 percent of the school-age population. Among residential school students, 75 percent were white non-Hispanic, 18 percent black, and 4 percent Hispanic. There were no striking differences in racial/ethnic composition between public or private facilities, either day or residential, nor across facilities in terms of the primary disability of the majority of students.

---

[6]There is some evidence, from studies of secondary-level students, that students of minority background are overrepresented among special education students compared with the general population. For example, a 1987 study of high school juniors (Hayward, 1989) found that among non-special education students 72 percent were white, 15 percent black, and 8.5 percent Hispanic, while the comparable figures among special education students were 66 percent, 25 percent, and 8 percent.

C. STUDENT MOVEMENT INTO AND OUT OF SEPARATE FACILITIES

1. Admissions

Tables III.14 and III.15 summarize the movement of students into and out of separate facilities during 1987, separately for day and residential facilities, and by primary disability served by the facility.

In the 1987 school year, separate day schools had an average of 23 new students per 100 enrollees. Admission rates were highest in schools for students with and emotional disturbance (36 per 100). In the 1987 school year, separate residential facilities had an average of 31 newly admitted students per 100 enrollees. Admission rates were highest for facilities for students with emotional disturbance (59 per 100).

Tables III.16 and III.17 indicate the age distribution of students entering separate day and residential facilities in 1987, by the primary disability served at the facility.

About 35 percent of students entering separate day schools were 5 years or younger, and about 13 percent were 2 years or younger. About 55 percent of students entering day programs were ages 6 through 17; 9 percent were 18 through 21 years old. About 25 percent of students entered separate day schools as their first educational placement. About 27 percent of students entering day schools had previously been in separate classes in regular schools. About 20 percent had previously been in another separate school.

Table III.14

Summary of Day Student Movement in Separate Day Schools in 1987:
Type, Number, and Rate of Movement per 100 Students in Day Schools
by Primary Disability Served by Facility

Type of Movement	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
First Admissions	33.1	15.9	15.1	34.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	19.6	-	*	23.2
Readmissions	1.5	1.8	1.1	2.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.0	-	*	1.7
Discharges	28.8	14.3	12.5	32.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	16.8	-	*	20.7
Net Change[a]	5.8	3.3	3.7	4.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	4.8	-	*	4.2
Average Length of Enrollment (Years)	3.6	8.6	9.9	2.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	6.7	-	*	6.4

Notes.
Data on student movement were reported by facilities with 98,632 of the 136,593 students in the day facility sample.
A few "short-term" facilities (with more than 100% annual student turnover) were excluded from this table and counted as non-responses. Facilities whose reported net change (admissions plus readmissions less releases) was less than -25% or greater than 25% are excluded from this table and counted as non-responses. Average length of stay of "less than one year" was coded as .5 years.
Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.
[a] Statistic overestimates "net change" in two ways. Most importantly "discharges" are only reported for ages 0-21 years. Students who are not "formally discharged" before their 22nd birthday are not counted among discharges. In addition, deaths are excluded from the "net change" statistic.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.15

Summary of All Student Movement in Separate Residential Schools in 1987:
Percent of Total Students in Residential Schools
by Primary Disability Served by Facility

Type of Movement	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
First Admissions														
Day students	*	*	2.5	11.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	6.9
Residential	*	*	9.8	45.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	24.2
Total	*	*	12.3	56.5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	31.1
Readmissions														
Day students	*	*	0.2	0.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.4
Residential	*	*	0.6	2.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	1.9
Total	*	*	0.8	2.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	2.3
Discharges	*	*	10.3	54.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	28.8
Net Change[#]	*	*	2.9	5.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	4.7
Average Length of Stay of Discharges (Years)														
Day students	*	*	6.9	1.6	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	4.1
Residential	*	*	6.4	1.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	4.2

Notes.
Data on student movement was reported by facilities with 32,835 of the 56,626 students in the residential school sample; both day and residential students were included.
A few "short-term" facilities with more than 100% annual student turnover were excluded from this table and counted as non-responses. Facilities whose reported net change (admissions plus readmissions less releases) was less than -25% or greater than 25% are excluded from this table and counted as non-responses. Average length of stay of "less than one year" was coded as .5 years.
Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.
[#] Statistic overestimates "net change" in two ways. Most importantly "discharges" are only reported for ages 0-21 years. Students who are not "formally discharged" before their 22nd birthday are not counted among discharges. In addition, deaths are excluded from the "net change" statistics.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.16

Age Distribution of New Student Admissions at Separate Day Schools in 1987
by Primary Disability Served at Facility
(Percent of New Admissions Age 0-21)

Age of first Admission	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
0 - 2 Years of Age	2.4	13.9	8.2	0.3	*	*	17.5	*	*	30.4	28.1	-	55.0	13.1
3 - 5 Years of Age	13.4	21.8	22.6	5.4	*	*	54.2	*	*	65.6	29.4	-	40.4	22.3
6 - 11 Years of Age	47.7	19.2	31.1	25.1	*	*	19.8	*	*	*	26.1	-	*	25.3
12 - 17 Years of Age	33.7	26.4	21.5	63.5	*	*	*	*	*	*	12.2	-	*	30.1
18 - 21 Years of Age	2.8	18.6	16.6	5.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	4.3	-	0.0	9.1
TOTAL NEW STUDENT ADMISSIONS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0

Notes:
Data for this table were reported by facilities with 50,485 of the 136,593 students in the day school sample.
Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.17

Age Distribution of New Admissions at Separate Residential Schools in 1987 by Primary Disability Served at Facility
(Percent of New Residential Admissions Age 0-21)

Age of First Admission	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
RESIDENTIAL ONLY														
0 - 2 Years of Age	*	0.0	8.4	1.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	3.6
3 - 5 Years of Age	*	0.0	9.8	4.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	6.4
6 - 11 Years of Age	*	*	19.8	21.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	39.2	*	*	22.5
12 - 17 Years of Age	*	34.6	23.6	67.5	*	*	*	*	*	*	27.3	*	*	51.3
18 - 21 Years of Age	*	59.4	38.5	5.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	16.3
TOTAL NEW RESIDENT ADMISSIONS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
DAY STUDENTS ONLY														
0 - 2 Years of Age	*	0.0	22.6	0.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.0	-	*	3.8
3 - 5 Years of Age	*	0.0	22.4	10.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	15.8
6 - 11 Years of Age	*	*	4.3	25.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	62.9	-	*	24.9
12 - 17 Years of Age	*	53.4	15.7	63.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	48.2
18 - 21 Years of Age	*	43.8	35.0	0.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	7.3
TOTAL NEW DAY STUDENT ADMISSIONS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0

Notes:
Data for this table were reported by facilities with 21,912 of the 56,621 students in the residential facility sample.
Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

About 12 percent of students entering separate schools had been in regular class with or without resource room support.

About 68 percent of new entrants into residential facilities were 12 years or older, and only about 10 percent were under 6 years. Residential schools for students with mental retardation were particularly likely to enroll older students: 59 percent of students entering facilities primarily serving persons with mild and moderate retardation and 39 percent of those entering facilities for severe and profound retardation were in the 18- through 21-year-old age range. Only about 10 percent of new students were entering residential facilities for their first educational experience. Students entering facilities for severe or profound mental retardation (16 percent), were particularly likely to be beginning their education in the separate facility. Over half (52 percent) of new students in residential facilities had previously been in regular school settings, either in special classes (32 percent) or in regular classes (20 percent).

About 22 percent of new admissions to residential schools were day students who did not reside at the facility. Over two-thirds (69 percent) of newly admitted residential students came from their natural, adoptive, or foster homes. About one-quarter (25.5 percent) of entering students had previously been in another congregate-living situation, about 14 percent in public residential facilities of 16 or more residents. The students particularly likely to be moving from one residential facility to another were students entering facilities for persons with severe or profound mental retardation (33 percent of new admissions).

2. Releases

In the 1987 school year, separate day schools had an average of 21 students leave the school per 100 enrollees. Release rates were highest in schools primarily serving students with emotional disturbance (32 per 100). Nationwide, students leaving day schools averaged about 6 years of program enrollment.

The average length of stay of students leaving separate residential facilities was about 4 years. About 58 percent of students leaving separate residential schools did so between the ages of 12 and 17. About 21 percent left before age 12. About 69 percent of exiting students from schools for students with emotional disturbance were in the 12- through 17-year-old age range.

Most children and youth (17 years and younger) leaving separate day school returned to regular schools (61.5 percent), including about 43 percent who went to separate classes and about 19 percent who went to regular classes with or without resource room assistance. Most young adults (18 through 21 years) leaving separate day facilities entered competitive employment (13 percent) or vocational training programs (53 percent of those whose new placement was known). About 3 percent entered postsecondary educational institutions.

Most children and youth (17 years or younger) leaving separate residential facilities returned to regular school environments--37 percent entering separate classes in regular school buildings and 23 percent entering regular classes. About one-quarter (23 percent) of residential students age

17 or younger left to enter other separate day or residential schools, most (67 percent) leaving to enter other residential facilities. The most common subsequent placement for young adults (age 18 through 21) leaving residential schools was postsecondary academic education or vocational training (about 30 percent).

About one-half (49 percent) of students leaving residential facilities returned to or established their own home. Students least likely to return to or establish a home for themselves were leaving schools focused primarily on severe or profound mental retardation (23 percent).

Tables III.18 and III.19 indicate the percent of separate facilities providing each of a wide range of potential services to students leaving the facility. Almost universally, students leaving both day and residential separate facilities have their records transferred to their new school, and have their parents involved in planning and preparing for their transfer to a new placement. Between 70 percent and 85 percent of separate day and residential facilities arrange a visit with the student to the new placement, provide training in skills and behaviors specifically required in the new placement, plan for the new placement with the LEA and do some kind of follow-up to monitor the success of the new placement. Less frequently provided were additional services after the student's transfer to the new placement, vocational counseling, and job placement assistance.

A substantial proportion of administrators of separate facilities noted that securing appropriate educational, developmental, or vocational

Table III.18

Provision of Services by Separate Day Schools to Exiting Students,
by Primary Disability Served at Facility
(Percent of Day Schools)

Services to Exiting Students	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
Arranging transfer of records to new school	*	97.1	98.3	97.4	*	-	*	*	*	*	97.8	-	*	97.7
Visiting new placement with an exiting student	*	77.0	75.9	79.0	*	-	48.2	*	*	*	79.1	-	*	74.5
Training in skills/behavior specifically required in new placement	*	78.3	80.4	70.0	*	-	45.1	*	*	*	89.2	-	*	76.1
Involving parents in planning and preparation for transfer to new placement	*	95.5	92.1	97.8	*	-	*	*	*	*	95.4	-	*	95.2
Follow-up to monitor success of new placement	*	68.4	47.5	82.6	*	-	*	*	*	*	74.1	-	*	66.2
Joint planning with the LEA for transition	*	82.5	81.0	81.4	*	-	*	*	*	*	94.1	-	*	84.4
Providing back-up or additional services after new placement	*	59.0	39.6	72.8	*	-	44.0	*	*	*	63.7	-	*	54.7
Providing guidance and vocational counseling to exiting students	53.9	72.2	45.6	68.9	*	-	34.3	*	*	*	48.4	-	*	54.7
Providing job placement services	49.9	63.3	36.7	35.8	*	-	*	*	*	*	32.9	-	*	39.9
Other	51.1	78.7	52.8	66.7	*	-	*	*	*	*	53.9	-	*	57.8

Table III.18 (continued)

Services to Exiting Students	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PRIVATE														
Arranging transfer of records to new school	*	*	*	94.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	95.7
Visiting new placement with an exiting student	68.9	71.2	*	78.7	*	*	52.8	*	*	*	86.5	-	*	76.5
Training in skills/behavior specifically required in new placement	70.3	81.5	78.5	78.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	80.4	-	*	78.1
Involving parents in planning and preparation for transfer to new placement	*	*	*	95.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	95.4
Follow-up to monitor success of new placement	78.6	76.9	81.3	78.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	75.5	-	*	76.0
Joint planning with the LEA for transition	84.3	85.4	79.9	86.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	83.0
Providing back-up or additional services after new placement	63.6	60.2	47.2	62.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	53.9	-	*	60.6
Providing guidance and vocational counseling to exiting students	48.1	42.1	48.8	73.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	31.9	-	*	47.6
Providing job placement services	*	38.6	45.7	32.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	24.8
Other	25.2	47.2	60.0	48.1	*	*	45.9	*	*	*	32.9	-	*	39.2

Table III.18 (continued)

Services to Exiting Students	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
ALL DAY FACILITIES														
Arranging transfer of records to new school	98.1	95.1	98.8	95.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	98.3	-	*	96.9
Visiting new placement with an exiting student	73.3	75.6	78.9	78.8	*	*	50.0	*	*	67.6	82.0	-	67.2	75.4
Training in skills/behavior specifically required in new placement	72.1	79.2	79.9	74.1	*	*	59.5	*	*	74.4	85.7	-	79.9	76.9
Involving parents in planning and preparation for transfer to new placement	92.5	93.3	94.1	96.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	96.8	-	*	95.3
Follow-up to monitor success of new placement	74.0	70.9	56.2	80.7	*	*	75.6	*	*	54.2	74.6	-	54.2	70.3
Joint planning with the LEA for transition	68.3	83.4	80.7	83.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	92.7	-	87.6	83.8
Providing back-up or additional services after new placement	61.9	59.4	41.5	67.7	*	*	58.9	*	*	39.0	59.0	-	48.6	57.1
Providing guidance and vocational counseling to exiting students	49.6	63.5	46.5	71.1	*	*	28.3	*	*	*	41.8	-	21.2	51.8
Providing job placement services	22.8	56.1	39.0	34.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	23.0	-	*	33.6
Other	32.1	69.5	54.7	57.2	*	*	31.9	*	*	*	45.6	-	22.0	50.1

Notes.
Data for this table were provided by 1,309 of 1,315 schools in the day school sample.
Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.19

Provision of Services by Separate Residential Schools to Exiting Residential and Day Students, by Primary Disability Served at Facility (Percent of Residential Schools)

Services to Exiting Students	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
Arranging transfer of records to new school	-	•	•	•	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	-	-	97.8
Visiting new placement with an exiting student	-	•	•	76.3	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	-	-	83.6
Training in skills/behavior specifically required in new placement	-	•	81.1	79.0	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	-	-	79.4
Involving parents in planning and preparation for transfer to new placement	-	•	•	•	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	-	-	94.2
Follow-up to monitor success of new placement	-	•	85.7	59.9	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	-	-	72.6
Joint planning with the LEA for transition	-	•	82.8	•	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	-	-	86.5
Providing back-up or additional services after new placement	-	•	78.6	67.6	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	-	-	71.0
Providing guidance and vocational counseling to exiting students	-	•	25.1	72.8	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	-	-	54.2
Providing job placement services	-	•	•	30.9	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	-	-	33.0
Other	-	•	44.6	65.1	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	-	-	62.0

Table III.19 (continued)

Services to Exiting Students	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PRIVATE														
Arranging transfer of records to new school	•	•	•	98.3	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	98.7
Visiting new placement with an exiting student	•	•	•	70.1	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	73.1
Training in skills/behavior specifically required in new placement	•	•	72.6	70.2	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	72.6
Involving parents in planning and preparation for transfer to new placement	•	•	•	95.6	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	96.6
Follow-up to monitor success of new placement	•	•	•	68.4	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	72.7
Joint planning with the LEA for transition	•	•	75.8	87.9	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	86.4
Providing back-up or additional services after new placement	•	•	66.5	67.0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	66.9
Providing guidance and vocational counseling to exiting students	•	•	33.3	59.0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	57.2
Providing job placement services	•	•	29.6	32.8	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	32.8
Other	•	•	29.0	53.2	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	49.5

Table III.19 (continued)

Services to Exiting Students	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
ALL RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES														
Arranging transfer of records to new school	*	*	97.8	98.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	98.4
Visiting new placement with an exiting student	*	*	87.4	71.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	76.7
Training in skills/behavior specifically required in new placement	*	*	78.0	71.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	74.9
Involving parents in planning and preparation for transfer to new placement	*	*	94.9	95.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	95.8
Follow-up to monitor success of new placement	*	63.1	85.8	66.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	72.6
Joint planning with the LEA for transition	*	75.7	80.3	87.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	85.1
Providing back-up or additional services after new placement	*	53.7	74.3	67.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	73.6	*	*	68.3
Providing guidance and vocational counseling to exiting students	*	*	28.0	61.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	32.8	*	*	56.2
Providing job placement services	*	63.9	23.1	32.4	51.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	32.9
Other	*	73.4	39.0	55.5	*	*	*	*	*	*	41.1	*	*	53.8

Notes.
Data for this table were provided by 623 of the 626 facilities in the residential facility sample.
Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

arrangements for students reaching the maximum age of enrollment or ready for a new placement, was a very serious problem. This problem (noted by administrators in 30 percent of public day schools, 27 percent of private day schools, 29 percent of public residential facilities, and 31 percent of private residential facilities) was particularly evident to administrators of facilities serving students with mental retardation. Among residential facility administrators, 37 percent at public facilities and 34 percent at private facilities noted that finding appropriate residential arrangements for exiting students was also a very serious problem.

D. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

1. Off-Campus Programs

Tables III.20 and III.21 indicate the proportion of students at separate day and residential facilities in three age ranges (birth through 5, 6 through 17, and 18 through 21) who take part in off-campus educational programs offered by another agency or program during the regular school day.

There were an estimated 53,062 children between birth and 5 years of age in separate facility day programs in 1988. About 9 percent of these students participated for 3 or more hours per week in educational or therapeutic day programs away from their day facility. About half (46 percent) of the approximately 4,900 birth through 5-year-olds participating in programs away from the separate day facility (about 4 percent of all birth through 5-year-olds in separate day programs) attended regular preschools or day care centers for at least 3 hours per week.

TABLE III.20

SEPARATE DAY SCHOOL STUDENTS ATTENDING EDUCATIONAL OR DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS ON OR OFF CAMPUS
BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY
(Percent of Students)

	Primary Disability Served by Facility													
Type of Program	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non-Categorical	Total
Age 0-5														
On Campus Full Time	*	89.9	88.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	94.9	-	*	90.8
Off Campus Part Time	*	10.1	11.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	5.1	-	*	9.2
Number of Facilities Providing Services to Students Age 0-5	76	336	362	139	31	*	146	*	31	80	261	0	86	1,573[a]
Age 6-17														
On Campus Full Time	94.1	88.3	92.3	88.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	90.3	-	*	89.6
Off Campus Part Time	5.9	11.7	7.7	11.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	9.7	-	*	10.4
Number of Facilities Providing Services to Students Age 6-17	206	436	480	596	30	*	94	*	36	54	279	0	52	2,281[a]
Age 18-21														
On Campus Full Time	*	81.3	87.1	81.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	86.7	-	*	83.4
Off Campus Part Time	*	18.7	12.9	18.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	13.3	-	*	16.6
Number of Facilities Providing Services to Students Age 18-21	72	419	431	314	*	*	58	*	*	*	205	0	25	1,575[a]

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

NOTES: Data on 0-5 year olds reported by day facilities representing 89,024 of the estimated 92,154 students in facilities with 0-5 year olds.

Data on 6-17 year olds reported by day facilities representing 123,322 of the estimated 123,967 students in facilities with 6-17 year olds.

Data on 18-21 year olds reported by day facilities representing 96,866 of the estimated 97,574 students in facilities with 18-21 year olds.

Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.

*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.

[a]Of the estimated 2,639 separate day facilities.

TABLE III.21

SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL STUDENTS ATTENDING EDUCATIONAL OR DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS ON OR OFF CAMPUS
BY PRIMARY DISABILITY SERVED AT FACILITY
(Percent of Students)

	Primary Disability Served by Facility													
Type of Program	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non-Categorical	Total
Age 0-5														
On Campus Full Time	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	90.6
Off Campus Part Time	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	9.4
Number of Facilities Providing Services to Students Age 0-5	*	*	103	140	56	*	*	*	*	*	47	0	*	400[a]
Age 6-17														
On Campus Full Time	*	74.3	74.8	84.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	81.5
Off Campus Part Time	*	25.7	25.2	15.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	18.5
Number of Facilities Providing Services to Students Age 6-17	30	79	257	603	63	24	*	*	*	*	86	0	*	1,181[a]
Age 18-21														
On Campus Full Time	*	69.6	74.0	76.2	58.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	73.5
Off Campus Part Time	*	30.4	26.0	23.8	41.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	26.5
Number of Facilities Providing Services to Students Age 18-21	*	81	249	215	56	24	*	*	*	*	75	*	*	753[a]

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

NOTES: Data on 0-5 year olds reported by residential facilities representing 27,775 of the estimated 27,775 students in facilities with 0-5 year olds.

Data on 6-17 year olds reported by residential facilities representing 55,484 of the estimated 56,101 students in facilities with 6-17 year olds.

Data on 18-21 year olds reported by residential facilities representing 37,272 of the estimated 38,23b students in facilities with 18-21 year olds.

Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.

*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.

[a]Of the estimated 1,250 separate residential facilities.

There were an estimated 7,436 children between birth and 5 years of age in separate residential programs in 1988. About 9 percent of the students participated for 3 or more hours per week in educational or therapeutic programs away from their day facility. About half (55 percent) of the approximately 700 birth through 5-year-olds participating in programs away from the surveyed separate residential facilities attended another separate program for children with handicaps for at least 3 hours per week. About a quarter (24 percent) attended regular preschool or day care programs that primarily served children who were not handicapped.

An estimated 140,217 children and youth between 6 and 17 years attended separate day schools in 1988. About 10 percent of these students participated for 3 or more hours per week in educational or other training programs away from their separate facility. About 22 percent of the off-site program placements were in other separate special education or therapeutic programs. About 18 percent of the off-site placements were in regular education classes and 33 percent were in special education programs in regular school buildings. Other external placements included primarily paid and unpaid work or work training.

An estimated 66,163 children and youth between 6 and 17 years were in residential schools in 1988. About 18.5 percent of those students participated for 3 or more hours per week in educational or other training programs away from their residential facilities. About 42 percent of these off-campus placements were in regular schools, either special classes

(21 percent) or regular classes (21 percent). About 12 percent of these students were in paid or unpaid work or work training.

An estimated 35,432 youth ages 18 through 21 years were in separate day school programs in 1988. About 17 percent of these students participated for 3 or more hours in educational, vocational, or therapeutic programs away from their facility. About 25 percent of those in off-site programs participated part-time in unpaid vocational training programs, about 19 percent were in part-time paid supervised work in non-sheltered settings, and about 11 percent were part-time in sheltered workshops.

An estimated 21,736 youth ages 18 through 21 years were in separate residential schools in 1988. About 27 percent of these youth participated for 3 or more hours per week in education, vocational, or therapeutic programs off the campus of the residential facility.

2. Primary Instructional Setting

An estimated 61 percent of preschool students (birth through 5 years old) in separate day schools had group instruction in classes of 6 to 11 students with handicaps as their primary instructional arrangement. About 18 percent were taught primarily in groups of 2 to 5 students, and 7 percent had individual (one-to-one) teaching as their primary instructional arrangements.

An estimated 51 percent of preschool students in residential schools (birth through 5 years) had group instruction in classes of 6-11 students as their primary instructional arrangements. About 28 percent were taught primarily in groups of 2-5 students. About 9 percent were reported to have individual teaching as their primary instructional arrangement.

About 72 percent of separate day school students of 6 through 17 years were reported to be taught primarily in classroom groups of 6 to 11 students. About 10 percent of 6- through 17-year-olds were usually taught in classes of 12 or more students. Groups of 2 to 5 students were reported as the primary teaching arrangement for 12 percent of the day school students, and individual instruction was the primary teaching arrangement for about 5 percent.

About 59 percent of residential school students of 6 through 17 years were reported to be taught primarily in classroom groups of 6 to 11 students. About 6 percent of the 6- through 17-year-olds were usually taught in classes of 12 or more students. Groups of 2 to 5 students were reported to be the primary teaching arrangement for 22 percent of the residential school students, and individual instruction was reported as the primary instructional arrangement for about 4 percent of residential school students.

About 65 percent of the 18- through 21-year-old day school students were taught primarily in groups of 6 to 11 students. About 15 percent of the 18- through 21-year-olds were usually taught in groups of 12 or more students. Small groups of 2 to 5 students were the usual teaching arrangement for about 11 percent of students, with individual teaching the most common teaching arrangement for 7 percent of the 18- through 21-year- olds in separate day schools.

About 51 percent of the 18- through 21-year-old residential school students had classes of 6 to 11 students as their primary instructional arrangement. About 8 percent were usually taught in groups of 12 or more students and about 26 percent in small groups of 2 to 5 students. Individual

instruction was the primary teaching arrangement for an estimated 5 percent of residential school students.

3. Student Evaluations

Virtually all (99 percent of) separate day schools reported that student education programs were evaluated on an annual basis or more frequently, and that parents, guardians, or surrogate parents received formal written reports of students' progress at least annually. About 66 percent of schools submitted 3 or more reports per year. About 85 percent of day schools reported at least annual meetings between school personnel and representatives of the students' local education agency or other education agencies to report on reevaluations of individual programs and/or to report on the progress of students. One-quarter of separate day schools reported an average of 2 or more such meetings per year.

As with separate day schools, almost all (98 percent) of the residential schools of all students provided at least annual reevaluations or revisions of student education plans. Almost the same proportion (97 percent) of residential schools provided parents, guardians, or surrogate parents with formal written reports of students' progress at least annually. About 72 percent of schools submitted 3 or more reports per year. A substantial majority (87 percent) of residential schools reported holding at least annual meetings between school personnel and representatives of the students' local education agency or other education agencies to report on reevaluations of individual programs and/or to report on the progress of students. Over 40

percent of residential schools reported an average of 2 or more such meetings per year.

4. Noninstructional Activities

Tables III.22 and III.23 present the percent of students in separate day and residential facilities who took part in noninstructional activities outside the regular school day in the month prior to the survey. The tables provide both the percent participating in each activity and the percent participating with nonhandicapped peers.

Most day school students were involved in various noninstructional activities through their school over a one-month period. About 71 percent were involved in non-classroom physical exercise and physical games (14 percent in activities involving nonhandicapped peers), 64 percent were involved in social activities such as parties (20 percent with nonhandicapped peers), 45 percent were involved in dance, music, or drama activities (11 percent with nonhandicapped peers), 62 percent went on field trips (17 percent with nonhandicapped peers), 27 percent participated in away-from-school events other than field trips (15 percent involving nonhandicapped peers), 16 percent were involved in competitive sports activities (4 percent with nonhandicapped peers), and 14 percent participated in special-interest clubs or groups (4 percent with nonhandicapped peers).

Most residential school students were also involved in various non-instructional activities through their residential school over a one-month period. About 79 percent were involved in non-classroom physical exercise and

Table III.22

Separate Day School Students Participating in Non-Instructional Activities During Previous Month and Participating with Non-Handicapped Peers by Primary Disability Served at Facility
(Percent of Students)

Non-Instructional Activities	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PUBLIC														
Social Activities, e.g., parties														
Participating[a]	*	59.7	72.4	45.6	*	-	*	*	*	*	69.5	-	*	62.0
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	16.9	21.2	9.7	*	-	39.1	*	*	*	42.5	-	*	21.4
Dance, Music, Drama														
Participating[a]	*	50.7	51.5	32.7	*	-	55.7	*	*	*	51.9	-	*	45.7
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	5.7	9.8	4.7	*	-	*	*	*		30.9	-	*	11.0
Organized Physical Exercise, Games														
Participating[a]	*	74.3	77.7	59.3	*	-	*	*	*	*	59.6	-	*	69.7
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	11.6	8.6	10.6	*	-	*	*	*	*	27.7	-	*	14.1
Field Trips														
Participating[a]	*	69.9	56.7	48.6	*	-	71.2	*	*	*	60.9	-	*	59.7
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	9.1	10.6	18.5	*	-	26.8	*	*	*	28.2	-	*	15.6
Other Off-campus Events, e.g., movies, concerts														
Participating[a]	*	31.9	27.6	19.8	*	-	29.7	*	*	*	27.2	-	*	26.9
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	10.7	13.1	14.7	*	-	*	*	*	*	20.3	-	*	14.5
Competitive Sports														
Participating[a]	*	25.3	20.2	14.1	*	-	*	*	*	*	8.4	-	*	16.6
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	4.0	3.5	1.4	*	-	*	*	*	*	1.0	-	*	2.8
Special Interest Clubs/Activities														
Participating[a]	*	21.9	19.3	9.2	*	-	*	*	*	*	11.0	-	*	15.5
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	3.5	5.0	1.3	*	-	*	*	*	*	4.5	-	*	3.61

Table III.22 (continued)

Non-Instructional Activities	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PRIVATE														
Social Activities, e.g., parties														
Participating[a]	45.9	64.1	80.8	69.3	*	*	*	-	*	*	78.8	-	*	67.4
Participating with non-handicapped peers	18.0	34.6	*	18.4	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	18.4
Dance, Music, Drama														
Participating[a]	39.1	*	72.2	47.9	*	*	48.0	-	*	*	58.6	-	*	44.3
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	*	15.3	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	9.6
Organized Physical Exercise, Games														
Participating[a]	83.3	49.7	82.3	87.7	*	*	54.9	-	*	*	65.8	-	*	73.6
Participating with non-handicapped peers	18.8	28.7	*	17.2	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	12.8
Field Trips														
Participating[a]	71.5	38.5	79.4	78.7	*	*	51.4	-	*	*	61.0	-	*	64.3
Participating with non-handicapped peers	15.5	*	49.6	23.2	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	18.5
Other Off-campus Events, e.g., movies, concerts														
Participating[a]	28.8	46.3	*	37.9	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	27.2
Participating with non-handicapped peers	18.2	50.7	*	13.7	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	16.4
Competitive Sports														
Participating[a]	20.2	14.5	*	24.2	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	14.5
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	*	12.2	*	*	*	-	*	*	0.0	-	*	6.1
Special Interest Clubs/Activities														
Participating[a]	19.7	*	*	25.1	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	11.8
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	*	10.2	*	*	*	-	*	*	0.0	-	*	4.1

Table III.22 (continued)

Non-Instructional Activities	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
ALL DAY FACILITIES														
Social Activities, e.g., parties														
Participating[a]	52.3	61.1	74.4	55.2	*	*	72.9	*	*	*	72.8	-	51.8	64.2
Participating with non-handicapped peers	12.8	21.6	17.7	14.0	*	*	33.5	*	*	36.7	29.3	-	31.7	20.2
Dance, Music, Drama														
Participating[a]	33.9	38.2	56.4	38.8	*	*	51.7	*	*	57.2	54.3	-	53.6	45.1
Participating with non-handicapped peers	6.8	4.9	9.2	9.8	*	*	21.2	*	*	*	21.5	-	20.9	10.5
Organized Physical Exercise, Games														
Participating[a]	80.0	66.6	78.8	70.8	*	*	65.1	*	*	*	61.9	-	57.6	71.3
Participating with non-handicapped peers	13.4	15.9	6.8	13.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	18.5	-	15.5	13.6
Field Trips														
Participating[a]	71.5	60.3	61.6	60.6	*	*	60.9	*	*	58.4	60.4	-	49.9	61.6
Participating with non-handicapped peers	15.2	8.7	20.1	20.7	*	*	19.1	*	*	*	20.8	-	19.6	16.8
Other Off-campus Events, e.g., movies, concerts														
Participating[a]	32.0	36.34	24.5	27.0	*	*	20.4	*	*	*	21.6	-	25.6	27.0
Participating with non-handicapped peers	19.0	20.7	12.1	14.2	*	*	15.7	*	*	*	13.1	-	11.1	15.3
Competitive Sports														
Participating[a]	15.9	22.0	18.9	18.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	5.8	-	4.9	15.8
Participating with non-handicapped peers	7.0	5.2	2.9	5.7	*	*	*	-	*	0.0	0.6	-	0.1	4.1
Special Interest Clubs/Activities														
Participating[a]	19.0	17.4	16.2	15.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	7.8	-	2.3	14.0
Participating with non-handicapped peers	6.2	2.8	4.7	5.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.7	-	2.9	3.8

Notes.
Data for this table were provided by day facilities with 50,942 of the total 136,593 students in sampled facilities.
[a] Includes all students participating in the activity with handicapped and/or with non-handicapped peers.
Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.23

Separate Residential School Students Participating in Non-Instructional Activities During Previous Month and Participating With Non-Handicapped Peers by Primary Disability Served at Facility
(Percent of Students)

Non-Instructional Activities	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													Total
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	
PUBLIC														
Social Activities, e.g., parties														
Participating[a]	-	*	77.2	60.4	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	72.9
Participating with non-handicapped peers	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	16.8
Dance, Music, Drama														
Participating[a]	-	*	56.5	27.7	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	40.9
Participating with non-handicapped peers	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	9.2
Organized Physical Exercise, Games														
Participating[a]	-	*	66.8	59.7	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	65.2
Participating with non-handicapped peers	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	9.2
Field Trips														
Participating[a]	-	*	57.3	46.5	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	54.6
Participating with non-handicapped peers	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	10.3
Other Off-campus Events, e.g., movies, concerts														
Participating[a]	-	*	41.1	48.0	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	46.4
Participating with non-handicapped peers	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	17.6
Competitive Sports														
Participating[a]	-	*	*	18.1	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	18.5
Participating with non-handicapped peers	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	7.2
Special Interest Clubs/Activities														
Participating[a]	-	*	*	21.3	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	17.0
Participating with non-handicapped peers	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	6.2

Table III.23 (continued)

Non-Instructional Activities	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
PRIVATE														
Social Activities, e.g., parties														
Participating[a]	*	*	*	76.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	78.6
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	18.8	14.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	17.2
Dance, Music, Drama														
Participating[a]	*	*	70.2	48.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	52.7
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	19.1	6.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9.1
Organized Physical Exercise, Games														
Participating[a]	*	*	*	84.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	85.4
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	*	9.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	11.3
Field Trips														
Participating[a]	*	*	68.4	75.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	72.9
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	17.9	13.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	14.3
Other Off-campus Events, e.g., movies, concerts														
Participating[a]	*	*	63.2	61.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	53.4	*	*	58.9
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	25.1	22.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	21.6
Competitive Sports														
Participating[a]	*	*	*	28.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	26.0
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	*	4.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	8.8
Special Interest Clubs/Activities														
Participating[a]	*	*	*	26.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	25.5
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	*	3.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	5.8

Table III.23 (continued)

Non-Instructional Activities	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	Total
ALL RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES														
Social Activities, e.g., parties														
Participating[a]	*	*	83.1	73.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	76.7
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	50.9	14.8	13.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	17.1
Dance, Music, Drama														
Participating[a]	*	52.1	62.3	44.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	31.8	*	*	48.8
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	14.7	6.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9.1
Organized Physical Exercise, Games														
Participating[a]	*	*	76.5	79.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	67.2	*	*	78.8
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	9.7	8.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	10.6
Field Trips														
Participating[a]	*	*	62.5	69.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	71.9	*	*	66.7
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	12.8	12.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	12.9
Other Off-campus Events, e.g., movies, concerts														
Participating[a]	*	*	51.5	58.1	53.7	*	*	*	*	*	46.8	*	*	54.7
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	41.9	18.8	19.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	20.2
Competitive Sports														
Participating[a]	*	38.4	12.6	26.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	27.9	*	*	23.5
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	1.5	4.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	8.2
Special Interest Clubs/Activities														
Participating[a]	*	*	8.8	25.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	22.6
Participating with non-handicapped peers	*	*	4.1	3.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	5.9

Notes.
Data for this table were provided by residential facilities with 20,901 of 56,626 total students in sampled facilities.
[a] Includes all students participating in the activity with handicapped and/or with non-handicapped peers.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

physical games (11 percent in activities involving nonhandicapped peers), 77 percent were involved in social activities such as parties (17 percent with nonhandicapped peers), 49 percent were involved in dance, music, or drama activities (9 percent with nonhandicapped peers), 67 percent went on field trips (13 percent with nonhandicapped peers), 55 percent participated in off-campus events other than field trips (20 percent with nonhandicapped peers), 24 percent were involved in competitive sports activities (8 percent with nonhandicapped peers), and 23 percent participated in special-interest clubs or groups (6 percent with nonhandicapped peers).

Administrators at about one-quarter to one-third of separate day facilities noted that "providing adequate opportunities for students to interact with nonhandicapped peers" as a very serious problem (31 percent at public day schools and 25 percent at private day schools). The comparable figures from administrators at separate residential facilities were somewhat less (25 percent at public residential facilities and 15 percent at private residential facilities). This may reflect administrators' differing expectations in different settings, and the need in many residential programs to devote considerable time outside the regular school day to therapy and treatment, limiting the time available for interaction off the grounds of the facility.

E. STAFF AT SEPARATE FACILITIES

Tables III.24 and III.25 provide data on the average staff hours per week per student in separate day and residential facilities for various categories

Table III.24

Staff Availability at Separate Day Schools by Type of Staff and Primary Disability Served at Facility
(Average Hours Per Week Per Type of Staff per Student)

Type of Staff	Primary Disability Served by the Facility: Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	All Facilities
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF[a]	2.8	2.0	2.0	2.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.7	-	*	2.2
CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF														
Classroom Teachers, Certified for Special Education	3.8	4.0	4.5	4.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	3.2	-	*	3.9
Classroom Teacher, Certified for Regular not special Education	1.1	0.6	0.1	0.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.1	-	*	0.5
Classroom Teachers, Non-certified	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.2	-	*	0.3
Classroom assistants, para-professionals, aides	1.9	5.0	6.4	3.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	5.0	-	*	4.5
Interpreter aides, readers, tutors	0.1	0.2	0.1	<0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	<0.1	-	*	0.1
Instructional consultants, in-service trainers	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.1	-	*	0.1
Classroom personal care assistants	0.0	<0.1	0.2	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	<0.1	-	*	0.1
Other classroom instructional staff	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.1	-	*	0.1
Total Instructional	7.6	10.4	11.8	9.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	8.7	-	*	9.6
SUPPORT AND RELATED SERVICES STAFF														
Psychologists & Behavior Analysts	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.2	-	*	0.4
Psychiatrists	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	<0.1	-	*	<0.1
Counselors, social workers	0.1	0.9	0.3	1.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.2	-	*	0.8
Physical therapists	<0.1	0.3	0.4	<0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.4	-	*	0.3
Occupational therapists	0.1	0.2	0.4	<0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.4	-	*	0.3
Speech & language therapists	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.7	-	*	0.6
Transition, community living skills trainers	<0.1	0.8	0.1	<0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	<0.1	-	*	0.2
Vocational specialists	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	<0.1	-	*	0.1
Remedial academics teachers	0.2	0.1	<0.1	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	<0.1	-	*	0.1
Physical education, recreation teacher	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.3	-	*	0.3
Music and art teachers	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.1	-	*	0.1
Librarians and media specialists	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	<0.1	-	*	<0.1
Physicians, dentists	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	<0.1	-	*	<0.1
Medical and dental nurses, technicians	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.3	-	*	0.2
Low vision specialists, mobility trainers	<0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	<0.1	-	*	<0.1
Hearing specialists, audiologists	<0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	<0.1	-	*	<0.1
Other support related services staff	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.2	-	*	0.2
Total Support	1.9	4.7	3.5	4.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	3.0	-	*	3.7
OPERATIONS AND TRANSPORTATION (Custodial, maintenance, food service, transport, etc.)	0.8	2.9	3.6	1.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.8	-	*	2.3
VOLUNTEERS	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.3	-	*	0.4

Notes.
Data for this table were reported by 540 of 1,315 schools (unweighted) in the day school sample.
Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.
[a]Includes hours committed to all administrative roles including principals, directors, assistants, noninstructional unit and department heads, accountants, admissions personnel, secretaries, etc.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.25

Staff Availability at Separate Residential Schools by Type of Staff and Primary Disability Served at Facility
(Average Hours Per Week Per Type of Staff per Student)

Type of Staff	Primary Disability Served by the Facility													
	Learning Disability	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Visual Impairment	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment	Health Impairment	Autism	Speech or Language Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Deaf-Blind	Non Categorical	All Facilities
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF[a]	*	*	9.4	8.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	8.3
CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF														
Classroom Teachers, Certified for Special Education	*	*	5.2	4.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	4.7
Classroom Teacher, Certified for Regular not Special Education	*	*	0.4	1.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	1.1
Classroom Teachers Non-certified	*	*	0.5	0.5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.6
Classroom assistants, para-professionals, aides	*	*	6.2	2.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	3.5
Interpreter aides, readers, tutors	*	*	0.0	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.1
Instructional consultants, in-service trainers	*	*	2.1	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.6
Classroom personal care assistants	*	*	0.6	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.4
Other classroom instructional staff	*	*	<0.1	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.2
Total Instructional	*	*	15.1	8.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	11.0
SUPPORT AND RELATED SERVICES STAFF														
Psychologists & Behavior Analysts	*	*	0.6	0.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.7
Psychiatrists	*	*	0.1	0.5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.3
Counselors, social workers	*	*	1.0	3.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	2.5
Physical therapists	*	*	0.5	<0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.2
Occupational therapists	*	*	0.5	0.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.3
Speech & language therapists	*	*	0.9	0.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.5
Transition, community living skills trainers	*	*	0.1	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.2
Vocational specialists	*	*	0.2	0.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.3
Remedial academics teachers	*	*	0.0	0.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.5
Physical education, recreation teacher	*	*	1.0	0.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.9
Music and art teachers	*	*	0.2	0.5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.4
Librarians and media specialists	*	*	0.1	0.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.2
Physicians, dentists	*	*	0.4	0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.2
Medical and dental nurses, technicians	*	*	5.0	1.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	2.2
Low vision specialists, mobility trainers	*	*	0.1	0.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.1
Hearing specialists, audiologists	*	*	0.1	<0.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.1
Other support related services staff	*	*	0.3	0.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.4
Total Support	*	*	10.9	9.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	9.8
OPERATIONS AND TRANSPORTATION (Custodial, maintenance, food service, transport, etc.)	*	*	4.8	4.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	4.9
DIRECT RESIDENTIAL CARE STAFF (hours per week per residential students only)	*	*	21.6	21.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	20.0
VOLUNTEERS	*	*	0.6	0.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	0.3

Notes.
Data for this table were reported by 234 of 626 facilities in the residential facility sample.
Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.
[a] Includes hours committed to all administrative roles including principals, directors, assistants, noninstructional department and unit heads, accountants, admissions personnel, secretaries, etc.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

of staff. As noted earlier, most students at separate facilities receive instruction primarily in group settings of 6 or more students. Therefore, average staff hours per week per student do not translate directly into average instructional time per student.

Total instructional staff time in day schools averaged 9.6 hours per week per student, or about 1 full-time-equivalent teacher per 4.25 students. Certified special education teachers averaged 3.9 hours per week per student (about 1 per 10 students). Paraprofessionals averaged 4.5 hours per week per student (about 1 per 9 students), with the rest of the instructional staff comprising nonspecial education teachers, tutors, assistants, instructional consultants, and others involved in classroom instruction. Total instructional staff time in residential schools averaged 11.0 hours per week per student, or about 1 full-time-equivalent teacher per 3.6 students. This was somewhat higher than the average of 9.6 hours per week per student in the day schools. Certified special education teachers averaged 4.7 hours per week per student (about 1 per 8.5 students), paraprofessionals averaged 3.5 hours per student per week, and classroom teachers not certified or not certified in special education averaged 1.7 hours per student per week, with other instructional personnel, assistants, and instructional consultants accounting for the remainder of the 11 total hours.

A wide range of support and related-services staff were available at separate day and residential facilities, including psychologists, social workers, speech, occupational, and physical therapists, and teachers who provide specialized instruction in remedial academics, music, art, and

physical education. On average, staff provided an additional 3.7 hours of support and related services per student per week at separate day facilities, and an additional 9.8 hours per student per week at residential facilities.

Private day schools reported modestly more average hours of inservice training for their staff members than did the public day schools. Private day schools reported an average of 30 hours of inservice training per year for each full-time equivalent (FTE) of instructional staff and an average of 24 hours for each FTE support and related services personnel. Public facilities reported an average of 24 hours of inservice training per year for each FTE of instructional staff, and 20 hours for support and related services personnel. Instructional staff of both public and private residential facilities were reported to receive an average of 32 hours of inservice training per year for each full-time equivalent position. Inservice training for support and related services personnel averaged 24 hours per FTE in private facilities and 20 hours in public facilities.

Turnover in instructional staff was reported to be slightly higher in private day schools than in public day schools. Private schools reported a 22 percent average annual turnover in instructional staff, as compared with 10 percent in private facilities. Related to the higher rate in private day schools were the reports by 62 percent of the administrators that "competing with the pay scales and fringe benefits of alternative employers" was a very serious problem, compared with 30 percent of public day school administrators. There was virtually no difference in the turnover of instructional staff in

private residential facilities (19 percent) from that in public residential facilities (16 percent). A greater difference was noted in the turnover of personnel who provide care and supervision to students outside the instructional program. Public residential facilities reported an annual turnover of their direct care staff members of about 24 percent, as compared with 35 percent in the private residential facilities. Associated with this difference in turnover, administrators of public residential facilities saw direct care staff turnover as a less important problem than did administrators at private facilities (29 percent and 41 percent reporting turnover to be a very serious problem, respectively). About half of private residential facility administrators reported that competing with the pay scales and fringe benefits of alternative employers was a serious problem, while only 34 percent of public residential facility administrators reported that this problem was serious.

F. ADMINISTRATIVE AND COST CHARACTERISTICS OF SEPARATE FACILITIES

An estimated 98 percent of all day school students were in schools reporting some form of current program licensure. An estimated 90 percent of students were in schools reporting current licensure by the State Education Agency. An estimated 99.5 percent of all residential school students were in facilities reporting current licensure by some public agency. About 85 percent of residential school students were in facilities reporting licensure by the State Education Agency.

Tables III.26 through III.29 provide data on the average costs per student reported by separate day and residential facilities.

Table III.26

Costs Reported by Separate Day Schools by Primary Disability Served

	Primary Disability Served by the Facility (Estimated Students 0-21 Years)													
	Learning Disability (21,500)	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation (50,803)	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation (44,847)	Emotional Disturbance (44,345)	Hearing Impairment (3,344)	Visual Impairment (*)	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment (11,888)	Health Impairment (1,789)	Autism (2,938)	Speech or Language Impairment (6,906)	Multiple Handicap (31,417)	Deaf-Blind (0)	Non Categorical (8,545)	All Facilities (228,716)
Annual Operating Budget														
Mean ($1,000s)	861	1,312	1,346	973	*	*	*	*	*	*	951	-	*	1,042
SD	1,742	3,049	2,422	2,195	*	*	*	*	*	*	1,169	-	*	2,110
Educational costs included in operating budget														
All costs	98.9%	96.5	96.8	92.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	97.2	-	*	95.7
Not all	1.1	3.7	3.2	7.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	2.8	-	*	4.4
Cost per student per day														
Educational services														
Mean	$33.13	36.50	37.25	49.20	*	*	*	*	*	*	44.13	-	*	41.18
SD	19.56	29.05	26.31	24.34	*	*	*	*	*	*	27.10	-	*	26.71

Notes.
Because operating budgets may include students 22 or older, this dollar value cannot be divided by total students under the age of 22 to determine per student values.
Costs were converted from annual values to per day costs by dividing by the number of days the facility was open each year. Many day schools only operated 9 months per year. Day programs were assumed to operate 5 days per week.
Data on operating budget was reported by 912 of 1,315 facilities in the day school sample; data on cost per student per day were reported by 782 of 1,315 facilities in the day school sample.
SD = standard deviation.
Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.27

Costs Reported by Separate Residential Schools by Primary Disability Served

	Primary Disability Served by the Facility (Estimated Students 0-21 years)													
	Learning Disability (3,097)	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation (5,334)	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation (12,631)	Emotional Disturbance (52,339)	Hearing Impairment (10,986)	Visual Impairment (2,649)	Orthopedic or Physical Impairment (941)	Health Impairment (*)	Autism (*)	Speech or Language Impairment (*)	Multiple Handicap (*)	Deaf-Blind (4)	Non Categorical (*)	All Facilities (95,335)
Annual Operating Budget														
Mean ($1,000)	*	*	9,035	2,697	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	4,605
SD	*	*	13,789	6,544	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	8,769
Educational costs included in operating budget														
All costs	*	*	67.5	72.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	74.1
Not all	*	*	32.5	28.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	25.9
Cost per student per day														
Educational services														
Mean	*	*	47.42	56.60	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	55.65
SD	*	*	34.57	35.66	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	35.74
Residential Services														
Mean	*	*	103.37	90.35	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	86.11
SD	*	*	59.44	48.75	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	52.66
Total														
Mean	*	*	143.04	138.87	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	132.84
SD	*	*	64.93	55.03	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	59.52

Notes.

Because operating budgets may include students or residents 22 or older, this dollar value cannot be divided by total residents under the age of 22 to determine per student values. Costs were converted from annual values to per day costs by dividing by the number of days the facility was open each year. Residential programs were assumed to operate 7 days per week.

Data on operating budget were provided by 469 of 626 facilities in the residential facility sample; data on cost per student per day for educational and residential services were reported by 367 and 379 (respectively) of 626 facilities in the residential facility sample.

Total cost per day does not equal exactly the sum of educational costs plus residential costs because of slightly different response rates for items reporting educational and residential costs.

SD = standard deviation.

Dashes indicate cells with one or fewer responding facilities.

*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.28

Cost Data for Separate Day Schools by Operating Agency

	Type of Agency Operating the Facility (Estimated Students 0-21 Years)										
	PUBLIC					PRIVATE					
	State Education Agency (4,514)	Local Education Agency (100,161)	Regional Agency, Consortium, IEU (45,690)	Other Public Agency (9,216)	All Public (159,581)	Individual, Partnership, Family Operated (1,029)	For Profit Corporation (4,777)	Religious Organization (2,624)	Non Profit Corporation (60,706)	All Private (69,135)	All Facilities (228,716)
Annual Operating Budget											
Mean ($1,000s)	*	1,085	1,334	*	1,128	*	*	*	947	953	1,042
SD	*	2,072	3,030	*	2,438	*	*	*	1,658	1,703	2,110
Educational costs included in operating budget											
All costs	*	98.9	81.5	*	93.6	*	*	*	98.2	98.5	95.7
Not all	*	1.1	18.5	*	6.5	*	*	*	1.7	1.5	4.3
Cost per student per day											
Mean	*	34.61	35.17	*	35.12	*	*	*	48.92	47.89	41.18
SD	*	20.56	22.28	*	21.45	*	*	*	30.74	30.16	26.71

Notes.
Because operating budgets may include students 22 or older, this dollar value cannot be divided by total students under the age of 22 to determine per student values. Costs were converted from annual values to per day costs by dividing by the number of days the facility was open each year. Many day schools only operated 9 months per year. Day programs were assumed to operate 5 days per week.
Data on operating budget was reported by 912 of 1,315 facilities in the day school sample; data on cost per student per day were reported by 782 of 1,315 facilities in the day school sample.
SD = standard deviation.
*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.
SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Table III.29

Cost Data for Separate Residential Schools by Operating Agency

	Type of Agency Operating the Facility (Estimated Students 0-21 Years)									
	PUBLIC					PRIVATE				
	State Education Agency (7,145)	Local Education Agency (5,386)	Regional Agency, Consortium, IEU (1,701)	Other Public Agency (22,544)	All Public (36,776)	For Profit Corporation (12,465)	Religious Organi-zation (3,251)	Non Profit Corporation (42,841)	All Private (58,559)	All Facilities (95,335)
Annual Operating Budget										
Mean ($1,000s)	*	*	*	8,739	7,560	*	*	2,946	2,819	4,605
SD	*	*	*	11,922	11,520	*	*	6,264	5,907	8,769
Educational costs included in operating budget										
All costs	*	*	*	76.5	77.3	*	*	72.6	72.4	74.1
Not all	*	*	*	23.5	22.7	*	*	27.5	27.7	25.9
Cost per student per day										
Educational services										
Mean	*	*	*	54.36	54.15	*	*	58.56	56.30	55.65
SD	*	*	*	41.70	38.74	*	*	34.61	34.37	33.74
Residential Services										
Mean	*	*	*	110.42	103.18	*	*	78.48	77.77	86.11
SD	*	*	*	60.64	66.17	*	*	42.48	42.24	52.66
Total Mean	*	*	*	148.09	139.65	*	*	132.82	129.75	132.84
SD	*	*	*	68.41	70.83	*	*	54.52	53.41	59.52

Notes.

Because operating budgets may include students or residents 22 or older, this dollar value cannot be divided by total residents under the age of 22 to determine per student values. Costs were converted from annual values to per day costs by dividing by the number of days the facility was open each year. Residential programs were assumed to operate 7 days per week.

Data on operating budget were provided by 469 of 626 facilities in the residential facility sample; data on cost per student per day for educational and residential services were reported by 367 and 379 (respectively) of 626 facilities in the residential facility sample.

Total cost per day does not equal exactly the sum of educational costs plus residential costs because of slightly different response rates for items reporting educational and residential costs.

SD = standard deviation.

*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances.

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

The estimated average daily costs of day school programs in the 1988 school year was $41. Overall, the cost per student per day in publicly operated day schools was $35, while the cost per student per day in private day schools was $48.

The average per-student costs of the educational component of residential schools was $56 per day. Costs in public and private residential schools were similar ($56 and $54, respectively). The residential components of the residential facility costs were considerably higher than the educational costs, averaging $103 per student per day in public facilities and $78 per student per day in private facilities.

Administrators at a third or more of all types of separate facilities (day and residential, public and private) reported that "obtaining adequate funding for programs or services to meet the needs of particular groups of students" was a very serious problem. The proportions of facility administrators reporting this problem were 34 percent for public day schools, 43 percent for private day schools, 32 percent for public residential schools, and 35 percent for private residential schools.

IV. STATE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCEDURES AFFECTING SEPARATE FACILITIES

In accordance with the requirements of Federal legislation, all States have put into place procedures to identify and provide educational services to school-age residents who have physical, emotional, or cognitive impairments that require specially designed instruction or related services in order to benefit fully from the educational process. States have available a number of types of procedures to regulate and influence special education programs and instructional practices, with the ultimate aim of improving the education provided to students with handicaps in all settings, including separate facilities. These procedures include:

- Funding (the level and distribution of entitlement and discretionary or special-purpose grants)
- Standards (in such areas as staff certification, student-staff ratios, class size, curricula, and graduation requirements)
- Monitoring (in terms of content or focus, preparation and follow-up activities, and sanctions or assistance associated with SEA review of facility records and procedures)
- Technical assistance and training (via seminars or workshops and consultation with individual facilities)
- Program development and dissemination (development, adaptation, and/or the distribution of curricula, instructional materials, procedural manuals, or information on state-of-the-art practices)

The Study of Programs of Instruction for Handicapped Children and Youth in Day and Residential Facilities entailed an analysis of State special education procedures to identify major variations in how these procedures are used in the States to affect educational practices at separate facilities.

This analysis drew upon a national survey of all States and the District of Columbia[1] and the case studies at eight selected States. In the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions the division directors or their designated staff were asked to complete a questionnaire regarding procedures in place during the 1987-1988 school year. The eight case study States (California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, and South Carolina) were visited in mid-1987. Discussions were conducted with staff in various State and other agencies involved with the provision or monitoring of special education programs or with the operation of separate facilities. Documentary materials related to special education procedures and separate facilities were also collected in the case study States, and State staff continued to provide input throughout the analysis process.

This chapter reviews the major findings of the analyses of State special education procedures, indicating the areas of variation across the States and focusing particularly on those aspects of the procedures which were reported to have the greatest potential impact on separate facilities.

A. STATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS AND THE ROLE OF SEPARATE FACILITIES

Over the period since the passage of P.L. 94-142, the proportion of the school-age population identified as handicapped has increased, as has the total number of students receiving special education services. Across the nation, the proportion of the resident population ages 3 through 21 served in the special education system increased from 5 percent in the 1976-77 school year to 6.5 percent in 1986-87. The total number of handicapped students

[1]Hawaii did not respond to this survey.

identified and reported by the States to the U.S. Department of Education increased between 1976-77 and 1987-88 from 3,708,601 to 4,494,280 students. The proportion of handicapped students served in separate facilities over the period has generally remained stable, however; in both 1976-77 and 1986-87 the proportion across all age groups was about 6 percent. There is, however, considerable State-by-State variation in these proportions. State-reported data for the case study States range from 3.3 to 12.7 percent of handicapped students served in separate facilities in 1986-87 (see Table IV.1). Some handicapping conditions are much more likely to be found among students at separate facilities than among handicapped students in general. The three groups in Table IV.1--mental retardation and multiple handicaps, emotional disturbance, and sensory impairments--are those with the greatest relative proportions served in separate facilities. Even so, there is considerable State-by-State variation in these percentages as well, as illustrated by the case study States.

In most States a broad range of agencies, both public and private, are involved in the provision of services, educational and/or residential, in separate facilities. In all States, local school districts have primary responsibility for special education, and 29 States reported in the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions that local districts operate at least some separate facilities in their State, almost all of such facilities being day programs. Some States (15, according to the Survey) also provide mechanisms for joint agreements among districts or for regional units (for example, at the county level) to operate separate facilities as well.

TABLE IV.1

PERCENT OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS SERVED IN ALL SEPARATE DAY AND RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENTS BY HANDICAPPING CONDITION[a]

1986-87

State	All Conditions	Mentally Retarded/ Multi-handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Sensory Impairments
California[b]	--	--	--	--
Connecticut	8.2	24.5	22.6	32.0
Florida	6.9	31.2	12.3	21.2
Illinois	7.5	23.8	26.8	12.3
Louisiana	8.8	31.2	22.2	25.7
New Jersey	10.4	42.3	37.7	31.4
Ohio	12.7	17.6	45.0	15.8
South Carolina	3.3	9.0	6.9	14.0
Nation	5.9	14.5	16.1	19.7

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, 1989.

[a] Percentage is based on all students with a particular handicapping condition.

[b] California did not report data in comparable form.

In 25 of the States, the State education agency (SEA) provides direct services to students with handicaps through the operation of separate facilities, most often residential schools for students with hearing or visual impairments. In all States, one or more State agency other than the SEA is involved in the operation of separate residential facilities for persons with handicaps; in general, the operating agency also provides the educational program for school-age residents, although in some States that responsibility has been or is being transferred to local districts or intermediate units.

Private schools for students with handicaps offer day and residential programs to students placed there by the local education agencies (LEAs) in all but eight States, according to the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions.

B. SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION WITHIN THE STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

All States have a subunit (division, department, or bureau) within the State education agency with primary responsibility for special education programs. In most (45) States, the SEA special education division is organized primarily by function, although many also assign staff to geographic regions of the State or use specialists in special education programs for students with particular handicapping conditions.

The major activities conducted out of the SEA special education divisions include administrative activities, such as planning and grants management (an estimated median of 18 percent of staff time across the States), compliance monitoring (19 percent of staff time), and technical assistance, program development, and dissemination (42 percent of staff time). Other activities can include interagency liaison with other State agencies, due process and

TABLE IV.2

MAJOR ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES OF DIVISIONS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN CASE STUDY STATES

	Organizational Basis	Functional Priorities, as Indicated by Distribution of Staff
California	Function and geography, with separate division operating special schools	Technical assistance
Connecticut	Function	Technical assistance and Compliance monitoring
Florida	Function, with program specialists for handicapping conditions	Program and Personnel development and Technical assistance
Illinois	Function, geography, and handicapping condition	Technical assistance and Program development
Louisiana	Function	Pupil appraisal and Interagency liaison
New Jersey	Function and geography, with separate division operating special schools and regional staff involved in LEA monitoring	Program and Personnel development, Compliance monitoring, and Mediation
Ohio	Function	Compliance monitoring (which includes Technical assistance) and Planning and management
South Carolina	Function, with subunits organized around handicapping condition	Compliance monitoring, Program and Personnel development, Technical assistance, and Planning and management

SOURCE: Based on analyses presented in Part One, Chapter III, Volume III.

mediation, and student evaluation. The case study States illustrate the diversity in the organization and activities of the SEA special education divisions, as shown in Table IV.2.

C. FUNDING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

In almost every State, Federal, State, and local funds are combined to support the costs of special education and related services provided to students with handicaps. State special education funding programs have several components. The principal component is the formula used to distribute State funds to districts to pay for the costs of students' educational programs. Other formulas are often used for funding programs for students placed in out-of-district programs, particularly those in State-operated, or private facilities.

The State funding formula, and variations in the formula or separate mechanisms used to fund students or programs in separate facilities, primarily provide the context for placement patterns rather than influence the educational programs at the facilities. That is, many State special education directors reported that formulas for the distribution of State special education funds may provide incentives or disincentives for educational placements in out-of-district facilities, whether operated by other districts or intermediate units, State agencies, or private organizations, depending upon how districts are reimbursed and for which types of placements districts are financially responsible.

1. State Funding of LEA Special Education Programs

Five general funding approaches are currently used by States to distribute State funds to local districts:

(1) Flat grant per teacher or classroom unit

(2) Percentage or excess cost

(3) Percentage of teacher/personnel salaries

(4) Weighted pupil formula

(5) Weighted teacher/classroom unit formula

Note that while a flat grant per student is a viable option and is used to distribute EHA-B funds to States and within States to districts, no States exclusively use this type of formula to distribute State funds to school districts for special education programs. Table IV.3 shows the distribution of all States across these five general approaches and the particular approach used by each case study State.

Flat Grant per Teacher or Classroom Unit. Using this type of funding mechanism, the State provides to each district a fixed amount of money for each special education teacher employed or for each classroom unit needed. Regulations typically define pupil-teacher ratios or class size and caseload standards, either by handicapping condition or by type of program (e.g., resource room).

Except for specified pupil-teacher ratios which typically vary by setting, the flat grant per teacher or classroom unit formula funds all LEA placements similarly and would not in and of itself affect the placement of students in separate LEA schools. However, the use of this funding mechanism is often accompanied by separate funding provisions for students placed outside the LEA. In some cases, these funding provisions were reported by States to provide an incentive for out-of-district placements if such placements were funded at a higher State share than programs operated by LEAs.

TABLE IV.3

FUNDING FORMULA USED TO DISTRIBUTE SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDS TO LEAS

	(a) Flat Grant	(b) Percentage or Excess Cost	(c) % Salaries	(d) Weighted Pupil	(e) Weighted Teacher/ Classroom	(f) Other
Case Study States						
California	X					
Connecticut		X[a]				
Florida				X		
Illinois	X[b]					
Louisiana			X			
New Jersey				X		
Ohio			X			
South Carolina				X		
Total	2 (25%)	1 (12.5%)	2 (25%)	3 (37.5%)	0	0
Total	10 (20%)	12 (24%)	5 (10%)	19 (38%)	2 (4%)	2 (4%)

SOURCE: Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions, conducted in 1988 as part of this study. The District of Columbia and all States except Hawaii responded to the survey.

[a]Percentage allocation formula for all special education costs plus excess cost grant for students whose program costs more than five times the average per pupil cost.

[b]The SEA also pays up to $2,000 per student for students who have extraordinarily high cost needs.

Percentage or Excess Cost. Under a percentage or excess cost formula, districts are reimbursed by the State for a percentage of the costs of educating children with handicaps. Reimbursement may be provided for a percentage of the full costs or for the costs which are above the average per-pupil costs for general education programs. Reimbursable costs must usually be in approved categories, and cost ceilings may apply.

As with the flat grant, the percentage and/or excess cost type of funding formula does not distinguish among placements for reimbursement purposes. Thus, there is likely to be no differential impact on separate facilities.

Percentage of Teacher/Personnel Salaries. Using this type of formula, the State provides districts with a percentage of the salaries of special education teachers and/or other special education personnel. The percentage may vary by type of personnel. For example, the salaries of certified teachers may be reimbursed at a rate of 70 percent, while aides' salaries may be reimbursed at a rate of only 30 percent. Pupil-teacher ratios are typically specified under this formula type. Minimum State salary schedules may also be included in the formula specifications.

The percentage salary formula has the potential to affect program placement if it is used to reimburse specific special education categories disproportionately (e.g., 60 percent of resource room teachers, and 50 percent of separate school teachers).

Weighted Pupil Formula. With this funding approach, the State pays districts a multiple of average per-pupil costs or other base rate, depending on students' handicapping condition and/or program. This type of formula may include other categorical programs in addition to special education (e.g.,

bilingual or compensatory education) and may also provide funding for general education programs, although some States choose to weight only the categorical programs. Pupil weighting formulas are used more often than any other funding method; across all States, 19 utilize this method.

According to State directors of special education, pupil weighting formulas may encourage student placements in higher reimbursement categories and can be used to reinforce less restrictive settings if they include differential weights for such placements.

The weighted pupil formula is used by the largest number of States (19); 12 States use a percentage or excess cost reimbursement formula; 10 use a flat grant formula. Pupil weighting formulas reflect the differences in the costs of serving children with varying handicaps and educational needs, but have been criticized as potentially reinforcing labelling and encouraging districts to classify students into higher reimbursement categories. This type of formula also has the potential to encourage student placements in higher reimbursement categories, including separate facilities, if these placements are reimbursed at higher rates than are other types of placements. Percentage or excess cost formulas allow districts to be reimbursed for a portion of the costs of educating students with handicaps. These formulas generally do not distinguish among types of placements for reimbursement purposes. Thus, districts would be able to receive equivalent reimbursement under such a formula for a high-cost program operated by the district as for similar programs provided in State, private, or other separate facilities. Flat grant formulas do not by themselves encourage the use of separate facilities; however, these formulas are often accompanied by other funding provisions for

students served outside the district, which may create an incentive for out-of-district placements if the State pays a higher share of such placements than for programs operated by the districts.

2. State Funding of Out-of-District Placements

In many cases, the funding mechanism used by the State to distribute funds to local districts is not used to fund out-of-district student placements. States use five approaches to fund such placements:

- Direct State appropriation to the facility
- Direct payment by the SEA to the facility, using the same formula used to distribute funds for LEA programs
- Direct payment by the LEA to the facility, with SEA reimbursement to the LEA using the same formula used to distribute funds for LEA programs
- Direct payment by the LEA to the facility, with SEA reimbursement to the LEA using a different formula than the one used to distribute funds for LEA programs
- Payment to the facility by a non-education agency

As required by Federal and State regulations, placement of a student with handicaps in a day or residential program outside of the district of residence (whether in a separate program operated by another district, by an IEU or consortium of districts, by a State agency, or by a private organization) occurs only after the educational needs of the student are assessed and the IEP developed. The educational and related services required by the IEP must be provided by the district through a recommended placement, either within the district or outside of it. Appropriate placement options may vary in cost to

the placing district and this factor was reported to be considered in selecting among options meeting the requirements of the IEP.

Most States operating intermediate education unit or regional programs fund placements in these programs using the same mechanism used to fund district programs, generally with the placing district paying tuition to the intermediate or regional program and receiving reimbursement from the State.

The vast majority of SEA-operated residential facilities receive direct State appropriations for their operation, and districts pay little or nothing of the educational costs of students placed in these facilities. In almost every State, at least one State agency other than the SEA operates a separate residential facility. The most common method used for funding residential placements in other State agency programs is for the placing agency to be responsible for residential costs, while the placing district or the SEA pays for the educational costs.

Data from State directors of special education indicate that the greatest variability in funding methods across the States pertains to the approaches used to fund private school placements. In some States, no State special education funding is provided for private school placements. The most common approach used to fund private placements is the direct payment of tuition by the placing district using the same or a different formula as is used to fund district programs. In some cases, the State funding formula can leave districts with greater costs for private school placements than for most in-district programs, thus serving as a disincentive to nonpublic school placement. On the other hand, in some States, districts can receive an equal

or greater reimbursement for private school relative to local district placements.

There is considerable variation both across placements within States and across States in the approaches used to fund out-of-district placements. However, the potential impact of any method for paying for the educational costs of out-of-district placements is confounded by the fact that many such placements are made for non-educational purposes, and by agencies other than the State or local education agencies. Overall, the methods used by States to fund within and out-of-district special education placements are not designed to impact on the programs offered by separate facilities. Rather, the major effect of State funding procedures stems from their potential to influence the selection among various appropriate in- and out-of-district placements, including separate facilities, through the operation of financial incentives and disincentives.

3. Use of Federal Funds

Federal funds are a source of funds frequently called upon by the States for program improvement efforts through the funds provided under Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (State Operated Programs) also provides a source of Federal funds for program improvement efforts.

EHA-B funds are provided annually to States based on the total number of handicapped children ages 3 through 21 reported by their local educational agencies as receiving special education and related services on December 1 of the previous fiscal year. Every SEA is required to flow-through a minimum of 75 percent of the funds received under the grant program to LEAs

intermediate education units to support the education of handicapped students. Local agencies are required to use these funds to provide direct services to handicapped children and must ensure that the funds are not used to supplant State and local expenditures for special education programs. Data from the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions (see Table IV.4) indicate that across all States an average of 81 percent of entitlement funds are passed through to school districts.

The remaining 25 percent of the Federal funds from the grant program may be set aside for use by the SEA, with up to 5 percent--or $350,000, whichever is greater--used to pay for administrative costs. The portion of the set-aside funds not directed for administrative uses (up to 20 percent) may be used to provide direct or support services according to State-established priorities. Some States elect not to use the entire 20 percent for such purposes, choosing instead to pass through additional funds to LEAs.

A wide range of programs are supported by almost all States with some part of their set-aside funds. States may fund activities undertaken by its own staff and may also use a portion of these monies to fund grants, competitive or otherwise, to school districts. The ability to use these funds to support State priorities and initiatives provides States with important opportunities to use funding to affect the content and quality of special education programs. Among the case study States, the set-aside was used most frequently to support resource centers and technical assistance networks, two activities geared toward program improvement. Florida and Ohio reported that almost all their set-aside funds were used for this purpose.

TABLE IV.4

ALLOCATION OF STATE'S FEDERAL GRANT UNDER EHA-B IN 1987-88 SCHOOL YEAR

(Percent)

	Flow Through	Administrative	Resource/ Materials Centers	Research Evaluation, Pilot Projects[a]	Other
Case Study States					
California	89.3	3.6	0	7.1	0
Connecticut	75.9	6.0	3.7	7.5	6.9
Florida	75.0	3.4	18.4	2.5	0.7
Illinois	75.0[b]	5.0	9.0	1.0	10.0[c]
Louisiana	80.0	5.0	d/	d/	0
New Jersey	94.0	5.0	0	0	0
Ohio	77.0	5.0	16.0	2.0	0
South Carolina	95.0	4.0	0	0	1.0
All States	80.6	5.0	3.4	4.0	7.1

SOURCE: Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions, conducted in 1988 as part of this study. The District of Columbia and all States except Hawaii responded to this survey.

[a]Includes development of materials which averaged 0.3 percent of EHA-B (ranging from 0 to 3.3 percent).

[b]Five percent must be used by the receiving district for in-service training.

[c]Reimbursements for room and board costs for students placed by LEAs at private residential facilities.

[d]Reported 15.0 percent of EHA-B funds allocated to these activities combined.

Another frequent use of the set-aside funds is to support pilot and research programs in areas of State-established priorities. This activity provides opportunities for States to evaluate and disseminate new instructional methods, or to experiment with innovative ideas and practices through pilot programs. Many States that use a portion of their set-aside funds for these purposes distribute the funds through a competitive grant process to LEAs and other educational entities within the State. In Connecticut, for example, recent priorities for competitive grants to LEAs included transition planning and placement for students with severe handicaps, non-biased assessment practices for minority students, the enhanced participation of Hispanic parents in the IEP process, and the development of programs for handicapped gifted and talented students. In Louisiana, set-aside funds have been used to support priority areas through competitive grants, including colleges and university personnel training programs, vocational education, general education and special education coordination, transition programs, appraisal services, regional support services, parent programs, and services for low-incidence populations.

It should be noted that State funds may also be used, in addition to Federal set-aside monies, to support various technical assistance, development, or dissemination projects.

Federal funds for handicapped students are also distributed to States under Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Chapter 1 of ESEA (SOP), formerly P.L. 89-313). Grants provided to States under this program are targeted for use to expand or improve educational services to handicapped children currently enrolled in State-operated or State-supported

schools and programs. A 1975 amendment to this program allowed the use of grant funds to follow handicapped children transferred from State-operated or State-supported facilities to programs operated by LEAs, in an effort to encourage the transfer of students to programs in their home communities. Thus, it is not surprising that most States report using Chapter 1 of ESEA (SOP) funds to supplement direct services provided to children in State-operated facilities and to develop programs for the transition of students to their community school (U.S. Department of Education, 1988). The ability of States to use Chapter 1 funds to supplement programs in State-operated or supported facilities provides another opportunity for States to affect the quality of programs in these separate facilities.

D. SPECIAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND MONITORING

Federal statutes and regulations governing programs for the handicapped do not generally specify exact program standards within which State and local special education programs must operate, although all such programs must operate within the general framework set forth by EHA.[2] Within this context, all States set some specific standards for the operation of special education programs for facilities under this jurisdiction. These standards provide minimum requirements for, enhance the uniformity of, and promote equity in the quantity and quality of instruction provided to students, in what is often a highly decentralized system of local control.

---

[2]Recent regulations for EHA (4/27/89) require that the States use their own existing highest requirements to determine standards appropriate to personnel who provide special education and related services to children and youth with handicaps. Since this regulation was not in effect during the data collection phase of this study, the impact of this Federal standard cannot be addressed.

To ensure the implementation of State standards and Federal requirements for operating special education programs, Federal requirements dictate that SEAs are responsible for ensuring that the provisions of EHA are implemented, by monitoring all educational programs within the State, including programs administered by any State and local agency. This requirement is designed to ensure that all program providers comply with the Federal and State requirements that set forth and guarantee the provision of a free appropriate public education to all handicapped children and youth. The process used by States to implement this requirement is commonly referred to as "compliance monitoring."

1. Special Education Standards

All States establish educational standards in the areas of staff certification and program content, to affect the quality of special education programs. These standards provide the context in which all education programs must operate within a State, including special education programs at separate facilities. The Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions contained a question that asked States to indicate whether the same standards applicable to LEA special education programs were also applicable to separate facilities operated by intermediate education units, State agencies, and private organizations in such areas as teacher certification, related services personnel certification, administrator certification, curriculum content requirements, length of the school day and year, student-teacher ratios, and maximum class or caseload sizes. Separate facilities are now generally required to conform to the same standards for staff qualifications and program content as the special education programs operating in local public schools.

Thus, educational standards by themselves do not provide States with a unique opportunity to improve educational programs at separate facilities.

2. Monitoring of Special Education Programs

Federal regulations require that State education agencies monitor all educational programs within the State to ensure that all providers comply with Federal and State provisions and guarantee a free appropriate public education for all students with handicaps. Because the Federal requirements emphasize compliance with procedures more than program content, the monitoring systems designed by the States are quite similar.

The monitoring of all public agency programs generally consists of three phases: the collection and review of documentary material, the on-site validation and review of records (including samples of students), and reporting and follow-up. Based on data from the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions, Table IV.5 indicates that the most frequent interval with which public special education programs are monitored is every three years, while Table IV.6 shows much greater variability in the use and frequency of off-site (paper) reviews. However, the greatest variation across States occurs in the last phase, in that some States use the reporting and follow-up phase to provide extensive technical assistance geared toward program improvement. There is also considerable variation across the States in whether special education programs are monitored with other Federally funded programs or in conjunction with reviews of general education programs, as shown in Table IV.7.

TABLE IV.5

FREQUENCY OF ON-SITE MONITORING FOR PUBLIC SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AMONG CASE STUDY STATES, BY TYPE OF PROGRAM MONITORED

(Frequency in Years)

	Type of Program Monitored			
	LEA Programs	IEU Programs	SEA Programs	Other State Agency Programs
California	3	3	3	3
Connecticut	3	3	NA	3
Florida	3	NA	3	3
Illinois	3	3	NA	Ongoing
Louisiana	3	NA	3	NA
New Jersey	5	5	5	5
Ohio	3	3	3	3
South Carolina	3	NA	NA	3
All States	3 years (28) 5 years (12)	NA (32) 3 years (11) 5 years (3)	NA (28) 3 years (13) 5 years (6)	NA (3) 3 years (25) 5 years (10)

SOURCE: Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions, conducted in 1988 as part of this study. The District of Columbia and all States except Hawaii responded to the survey.

NA = no programs of this type were reported.

TABLE IV.6

EXISTENCE AND FREQUENCY OF
OFF-SITE REVIEWS IN MONITORING PROCESS

STATE	Interval at Which Off-site Review Conducted		
	One-Year	3-Year	Other
California	Private Facilities		
Connecticut		LEAs IEUs Other State Agency Facilities	Private Facilities
Florida	LEAs SEA-Operated Facilities Other State Agency Facilities		
Illinois		LEAs IEUs	Other State Agency Facilities
Louisiana	LEAs Private Facilities	SEA-Operated Unified School District Program	
New Jersey	LEAs IEUs SEA-Operated Facilities Other State Agency Facilities Private Facilities		
Ohio		LEAs IEUs SEA-Operated Facilities Other State Agency Facilities	
South Carolina	LEAs		
All States[a]	LEAs (20) IEUs (4) SEA-Operated Facilities (8) Other State Agency Facilities (20) Private Facilities (19)	LEAs (13) IEUs (4) SEA-Operated Facilities (6) Other State Agency Facilities (7) Private (1)	LEAs (8) IEUs (3) SEA-Operated Facilities (4) Other State Facilities (8) Private (5)

SOURCE: Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions, conducted in 1988 as part of this study. The District of Columbia and all States except Hawaii responded to the survey.

[a]Number of States in which no off-site review was conducted, by the type of program operated:

LEAs (8 States had no off-site review)

IEUs (32 States had no IEUs or no special education programs run by IEUs; 6 States had no off-site reviews of such programs)

SEA-Operated Facilities (28 States had no such facilities; 3 States had no off-site reviews of such programs)

Other State Agency Facilities (3 States had no special education programs operated by such facilities; 11 States had no off-site reviews of such programs)

Private Facilities (13 States reported no such facilities providing special education; 11 States had no off-site reviews of such facilities)

TABLE IV.7

HOW SPECIAL EDUCATION MONITORING IS CONDUCTED
IN RELATION TO OTHER SEA MONITORING ACTIVITIES

	With Other Federally Funded Programs	With General Education Programs	With No Other Programs
Case Study States (N=8)			
California	X	X	
Connecticut	X	X	
Florida	X	X	
Illinois	[a]	X[b]	X
Louisiana		X	X
New Jersey	X[c]	X[d]	X[e]
Ohio			X
South Carolina			X
Total	4	6	4
Total	12	14	33

SOURCE: Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions, conducted in 1988 as part of this study. The District of Columbia and all States except Hawaii responded to the survey.

NOTE: More than one response was permitted.

[a]Selectively monitors programs at same time monitors Chapter 1 grants.

[b]Monitors special education staff credentials jointly.

[c]For State-operated programs.

[d]For local public programs.

[e]For private schools.

Compliance monitoring for programs operated by private schools differs substantially from the process used by SEAs to monitor special education programs and facilities operated by local public agencies, and several different processes are used across States. The process may include a detailed approval and certification process designed specifically for special education programs in private schools, or there may be a private school approval process applicable regardless of whether or not the students who are served are handicapped. Some States monitor private schools when the LEA in which they are located is monitored, while other States may monitor a special education private school placement but not the entire facility. Over half the States reported in the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions that compliance reviews associated with private placements were conducted by the SEA division of special education, with on-site monitoring typically at three-year intervals.

Virtually all States reported that monitoring had its primary impact on ensuring that special education programs meet minimum Federal and State regulations and that compliance reviews provide opportunities to encourage program improvements (see Table IV.8). About half the States reported that monitoring was increasingly focused on program content and instructional issues. States generally also reported that compliance monitoring was an effective means for identifying technical assistance needs for future dissemination and program development efforts. The auth[illegible]o monitor special education programs operated by other State agencies was seen as a particularly powerful tool to effect change at those facilities.

TABLE IV.8

ASSESSMENT BY SEA SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION STAFF OF IMPACT OF MONITORING
(Number of States Responding in Each Category)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The primary impact of monitoring has been to ensure that special education programs are meeting minimum Federal and State requirements.	39	10	1	0
Monitoring provides an opportunity to encourage improvements in special education programs.	27	22	1	0
Monitoring is an important way to identify needs and set priorities for technical assistance, in-service training, and program development.	21	25	3	0
Monitoring activities are increasingly focused on program content and instructional issues.	8	19	18	5

SOURCE: Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions, conducted in 1988 as part of this study. The District of Columbia and all States except Hawaii responded to the survey.

E. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, IN-SERVICE TRAINING, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, AND DISSEMINATION

A traditional role of State education agencies has been to provide local education agencies with information and assistance in maintaining and upgrading staff expertise and skills and in improving instructional programs, approaches, and materials. EHA mandated that States conduct systematic and regular assessment of the needs for program improvement and staff development and formulate State-wide plans to address those needs. States also continue to engage in a variety of other activities designed to assist special education providers in improving services delivered to handicapped students, and many fund special education resource/materials centers to supplement the efforts of SEA special education division staff in program improvement activities. Table IV.9 indicates for a number of particular technical assistance, program development, and dissemination activities the roles played by SEA staff directly and by staff at resource/materials centers in the State, based on data from the Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions.

1. Technical Assistance and In-Service Training

All States provide technical assistance and staff training services to special education providers through the SEA and generally also through other State agencies involved in the operation of separate facilities. Staff at all special education programs in a State have access to SEA staff and to special education resource/materials centers if these exist, although it was generally noted that the assistance and training provided through these mechanisms were often of greater relevance to staff at local districts than to staff at separate facilities, because the nature of student needs and programmatic issues differs between these two types of programs.

TABLE IV.9

ROLE OF SEA SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION STAFF AND SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE/MATERIALS CENTERS AS PRIMARY AND SECONDARY PROVIDERS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND INFORMATION
(Number of States Responding in Each Category)

	Primary Provider		Secondary Provider	
	SEA Staff Directly	Resource/ Materials Centers	SEA Staff Directly	Resource/ Materials Centers
Fund, support or conduct statewide or regional workshops/ conferences on procedural issues and practices	41	9	6	16
Fund, support or conduct statewide or regional workshops/ conferences on instructional issues and practices	23	16	20	10
Conduct workshops or seminars for staff at individual districts/schools on procedural issues and practices	28	13	13	5
Conduct workshops or seminars for staff at individual districts/schools on instructional issues and practices	22	16	17	4
Provide technical assistance to local districts/schools	39	9	10	13
Gather, maintain, or loan instructional materials, equipment, or professional publications	15	19	17	5
Produce specialized materials (e.g., media, braille materials, assistive devices)	9	14	7	3
Assist districts/schools in preparation for or follow-up to monitoring by the SEA	44	4	3	14
Produce newsletters reviewing new materials, promising practices, training opportunities, recent research, etc.	25	15	11	10
Produce manuals/reports on procedural issues and practices	46	0	4	14
Produce manuals/reports on instructional issues and practices	28	6	9	11

SOURCE: Survey of SEA Special Education Divisions, conducted in 1988 as part of this study. The District of Columbia and all States except Hawaii responded to the survey.

However, in some States, SEA staff and resource/materials centers are more specialized than in others and focus on programmatic issues associated with low incidence and severe handicaps of more relevance to separate facilities. Also, a direct and routinized link between monitoring and technical assistance, when separate facilities are monitored directly by SEA special education staff, was also reported to be an effective means of focusing on program improvement issues. These differences are illustrated by the case study States, as shown in Table IV.10.

2. Program Development and Dissemination

Program development is a resource-intensive activity and one that has been emphasized less consistently as a major part of the activities of SEA special education divisions. Resource/materials centers were reported to be the primary producers of specialized instructional materials. States appear to have focused their program development efforts to date primarily on identification and evaluation issues and on the design of programs to serve severely impaired students and those with low-incidence handicaps. More extensive involvement in program development appears to be associated with the development of Statewide curriculum requirements and the extension of these requirements to special education.

The dissemination of state-of-the-art information on special education regulations, procedures, instructional approaches, and materials is a mandated activity for SEAs under P.L. 94-142. In States where resource/materials centers have major responsibility for technical assistance and training, they also usually have responsibility for dissemination as well. Workshops and

TABLE IV.10

MAJOR DIFFERENCES AMONG CASE STUDY STATES
IN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

	SEA Staff Specialization in TA and/or Monitoring	Follow-up TA Linked with Monitoring	Organization of Special Education Resource/Materials Centers
California	Staff assigned to regions provide TA and monitoring	Automated tracking system; follow-up TA on compliance issues	13 regional units of resource network[1]
Connecticut	Special unit for TA	Follow-up TA available on request	Centralized center
Florida	Special unit for TA; Monitoring unit separate	Follow-up TA available on request	18 regional centers plus several State-wide centers
Illinois	All staff provide both TA and monitoring	Routine follow-up TA on compliance issues	Center specializes in visual impairments
Louisiana	Staff assigned to regions provide TA and monitoring	Follow-up TA available on request	Centers specialize in sensory and low-incidence impairments
New Jersey	Regional staff provide TA and monitoring of LEAs; central office staff assigned to regions provide monitoring of state-operated and private facilities TA provided by resource/materials center	Follow-up TA available on request	4 regional centers
Ohio	Staff provide TA and monitoring as unified activity	Routine follow-up TA on compliance and program improvement issues	16 regional centers plus one State-wide center
South Carolina	Staff provide TA and monitoring	Follow-up TA available on request	None

SOURCE: Information collected during site visits conducted in 1987.

[1]Recent budget cuts have eliminated this.

conferences are the single most important vehicle for the direct involvement of the SEA special education division in dissemination. Workshops and conferences are typically used for transferring information on instructional as well as procedural or regulatory issues. Staff at separate facilities are notified of these events, but participation was reported to vary greatly depending upon the topic addressed.

F. SUMMARY OF STATE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCEDURES

1. State Economic and Educational Context

The pattern of special education service delivery as it exists today in a State has been influenced by the economic health of the State, the population of students served in the special education system, State special education and general education legislation, and the impact of interest groups, the courts, and other State agencies providing special education to handicapped children. While these factors have influenced the use of separate facilities, all have only an indirect impact on changes in programs of instruction at separate facilities, as indicated below:

- Across States, there was no consistent relationship between State economic health and the approaches used to improve special education programs.
- Worsening economic conditions in specific States were reported to make it difficult for them to undertake significant education initiatives, although economic difficulties have improved interagency cooperation in the provision of services to handicapped students.
- In States experiencing economic growth and development, special education programs have not always benefited, since some States have opted to focus the increased availability of educational funds on general education reform programs.

- Increases in student populations were reported to be a force in maintaining or increasing the use of separate facilities due to the increasing demands for other educational environments.

- Special education legislation and general education reform initiatives had had little direct focus on programs in separate facilities at the time the case study data were collected in 1988.

- Court cases were reported to have played an influential role on policies affecting where students receive special education and related services, and advocacy group actions were reported to have made important contributions to improvements in programming at separate facilities.

2. Structure of State Special Education Systems

In some States, a multitude of local, intermediate, and State agencies are involved in the provision of special education services in separate facilities. In others, the special education system comprises a small number of State and regional agencies, while, in others, special education in separate facilities is largely the responsibility of State agencies or a consortia of districts. The organization of a State's special education system was associated with the number and type of students served in separate facilities but was not reported as a factor that necessarily influences programs in those facilities.

All States have at least one independent division of the State education agency devoted to special education, and these divisions are typically organized by function (e.g., program services and compliance monitoring), in some cases within geographic regions, rather than by handicapping condition. The States also vary a great deal in terms of the allocation of staff across functions. However, the organization of the special education division was not reported by the States as a major factor in how specific SEA procedures

might affect program improvements in separate facilities. The links reported between the structure of a State's special education system and programs at separate facilities can be summarized as follows:

- The strongest impact of SEA special education procedures was generally reported in local district programs, rather than in separate facilities operated by State or private agencies.
- In many cases, the jurisdictional barriers among State agencies operating separate facilities, particularly agencies with independent fiscal authority, were reported to have hampered State education agency efforts to bring about change in these facilities.
- The development of special interagency structures to facilitate the coordination of educational services to handicapped students has improved the ability of SEAs to affect change in separate facilities operated by other State agencies.

3. Special Education Funding

States generally use more than one mechanism to fund special education programs for students with handicaps, with the funding mechanism varying by facility operator. The findings on the impact of SEA funding procedures on separate facilities are as follows:

- The major impact of State funding procedures was reported to be in their capacity to influence the aggregate patterns of placement in separate facilities, through financial incentives and disincentives considered by districts in selecting among appropriate placements to meet individual students' needs.
- The methods used by States to fund special education placements were reported to have little impact on the programs offered by separate facilities.

- An important mechanism available to States to affect programs in separate facilities is the availability of Federal funds (i.e., EHA-B set-aside and Chapter 1 of ESEA (SOP)) which can be used to implement State-established priorities and initiatives, or to provide support services. Federal funds are a major source of funds used for the extensive technical assistance and program improvement efforts undertaken through State-wide resource/materials centers and provide seed money for pilot projects and evaluation efforts.

4. Special Education Standards and Compliance Monitoring

All States set educational standards in the areas of staff certification and program content in an attempt to affect the quality of education programs, but educational standards by themselves, which are now generally consistent across all special education programs, were not credited as instrumental agents of change for separate facilities. Rather, the ability of the SEA to ensure the implementation of standards through compliance monitoring was reported by the States to be an important technique for effecting change in separate facilities.

The compliance monitoring processes used by States are very similar, focusing on a cyclical process in which agencies are subject to a comprehensive compliance review by the SEA at specified intervals. States do not typically vary their monitoring procedures for special education programs in publicly operated separate facilities. The most variation among case study States in the monitoring process was in the reporting and follow-up phase. Other dimensions along which State monitoring procedures differ include the interval at which programs are monitored, the use of off-site reviews, the staff who conduct the monitoring, the use of coordinated compliance reviews, and the use of self-evaluations. The monitoring process for private facilities differs substantially from the process used to monitor public

agency programs, and only some States monitor private facilities separately from sampling and examining individual student placements during LEA monitoring.

Regardless of the approach used to monitor the various types of agencies, the impacts of the monitoring process were found to be similar across States:

- States agreed that monitoring is most useful for ensuring that all special education programs are meeting minimum Federal and State regulations, but that it also provides an opportunity to encourage improvements in special education programs.
- States reported that the greatest impact of the monitoring process was in facilities operated by non-education agencies, in that the Federal monitoring and general supervision requirements provide States with a powerful tool for requiring other State agencies to meet SEA standards for special education programs.
- Compliance monitoring is an effective method for identifying technical assistance needs which in turn can affect changes to service delivery and program quality.
- The ability of compliance monitoring to influence program improvement was reported to be particularly effective in States with a strong link between the monitoring and technical assistance systems.

5. Technical Assistance, In-Service Training, Program Development, and Dissemination

All States are routinely involved in the provision of technical assistance, in-service training and information dissemination to administrators and staff in special education programs Statewide, either directly or through organizations supported by SEA-administered funds. The involvement of the SEA in the development of curricula, instructional materials, and other products for the delivery of special education services is more variable across the States. States also differ in the proportion of

staff resources allocated to these support activities. Other major differences among the case study States in these areas are in the degree of specialization among State special education staff in providing technical assistance, the link between compliance monitoring and the provision of technical assistance, the existence and regionalization of resource/materials centers, and the existence of a Statewide mandated curriculum.

Regardless of the approach used to deliver technical assistance and training, program development, and information dissemination activities, these support services were reported to be a major vehicle for making improvements in the content and methods of instruction in special education programs in all settings. In general, the staff of separate facilities have access to the same technical assistance and training activities as other special education staff, but the focus of most such activities is on special education programs within local districts; thus, the participation of separate facility staff is highly variable. The impact of these procedures on separate facilities was expected to vary largely according to the participation level of staff from separate facilities.

6. Summary

In summary, the SEA procedures examined in this study can affect both the placement of students in separate facilities and improvements to programs in such facilities, although in general these procedures are not designed specifically for special education programs in separate facilities. The structure of State special education systems and the methods used to distribute State funds for special education programs are important factors in influencing the patterns of placement of students in separate facilities.

The State compliance monitoring system is reported to be one of the best methods available to States for identifying technical assistance needs, and the provision of technical assistance, in-service training, and to a lesser extent program development is seen as an effective method for initiating and supporting program improvements. The availability of Federal funds is important in helping States develop their capabilities for technical assistance, training, program development, and dissemination, particularly through EHA-B funds used for State resource/materials centers.

Despite the focus on the role of the SEA, there are overriding contextual factors which will influence the ability of the SEA to affect programs in separate facilities. While the economic conditions of the State do not appear to be related directly to the ability of SEAs to implement improvements to programs, jurisdictional barriers among State agencies operating separate facilities, particularly agencies with independent fiscal authority, in some cases have hampered State education agency efforts to bring about change in separate facilities.

V. CHANGES AND FACTORS AFFECTING CHANGE AT SEPARATE FACILITIES

Since the passage of P.L. 89-313 and P.L. 94-142 there have been substantial changes in the segment of the special education system that has been called in this study "separate facilities." This study documents these changes using two sources--the Survey of Separate Facilities, which provides national estimates of changes, primarily quantitative changes,[1] and the Facility-Level Case Studies conducted at 24 separate facilities, three in each of the case study States.[2] The case study data provided both more detailed information on the types of changes taking place at separate facilities since 1975 and information on the factors associated with those changes.

A. CHANGES IN THE STUDENT POPULATION AND THE MISSION OF SEPARATE FACILITIES

Table V.1 presents data on the 192 separate day schools and 295 separate residential facilities surveyed in the 1979 OCR Survey of Special Purpose

---

[1]The Survey of Separate Facilities conducted in 1988 provides national estimates of change based on two approaches to measuring change: (1) comparisons of data from the 1978-79 Office of Civil Rights Survey of Special Purpose Facilities with comparable data from the 1988 Survey of Separate Facilities for the 487 facilities surveyed in both studies, and (2) an analysis of retrospective reports for 1976, obtained during the 1988 Survey, from current administrators of the 1,498 facilities in operation in both 1976 and 1988.

[2]These 24 facilities were selected to include 10 primarily serving students with mental retardation or multiple handicaps, 10 serving emotionally disturbed students, and 4 serving sensory impaired (hearing or visually impaired) students. They included 9 facilities operated by State agencies, 10 operated by local or regional public agencies, and 5 operated by private organizations. Twelve operated day programs only, 7 operated residential programs only, and 5 were residential facilities that also accepted day students. In terms of the number of students served from birth through age 21, the case study facilities ranged in size from 20 to over 500 students.

TABLE V.1

CHANGES IN NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED
IN SEPARATE FACILITIES SURVEYED IN 1979 AND 1988

	1979 OCR Survey[a]			1988 OSEP Survey[b]			% Change 1979 - 1988		
	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total
Day Facilities									
Total Number of Students Served	5,320	14,521	19,841	7,136	13,580	20,716	+34.1	-6.5	+4.4
Total Number of Facilities	50	142	192	50	142	192	50	142	192
Residential Facilities									
Total Number of Students Served	31,802	11,912	43,714	19,053	14,093	33,146	-40.1	+18.3	-24.2
Total Number of Facilities	163	132	295	163	132	295	163	132	295

[a]SOURCE: 1978-79 OCR Survey of Special Purpose Facilities.

[b]SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study for the Office of Special Education Programs.

NOTE: Because the facilities represented in this table were a nonrandom subset of the total population of facilities--that is, they were selected because they had previously been surveyed in the 1978-79 OCR Survey of Special Purpose Facilities which did not include the full universe of facilities in operation at that time--the statistics presented here are not based on weighted data and cannot be generalized to all facilities that may have been in existence since 1979.

Facilities and then followed up as part of the 1988 OSEP Survey of Separate Facilities. In examining statistics from this follow-up study, it is important to note that the nature and extent of changes among these facilities do not necessarily reflect changes in separate day schools generally. Schools which closed or became "integrated" between 1979 and 1988 (thereby no longer operating as separate facilities that provide education exclusively to handicapped students) were excluded from the follow-up survey. As such, the comparison focuses on what changed between 1979 and 1988 among a sample of individual schools, rather than in the general utilization patterns of separate schools.

Since 1979, the number of students served in the separate day facilities surveyed previously by OCR increased slightly (by 875 students, or about 4 percent), while the number of students in separate residential facilities decreased dramatically (by 10,568 students, or 24 percent). However, these changes were not evenly distributed across public and private facilities, as shown in Table V.1.

The public separate day schools in operation since 1979 had an increase of 34 percent in the size of their student populations, while private day schools showed a small decrease of about 6.5 percent. The major factors in the increases in the number of students served in public separate day schools reported by the case study facilities were general population increases in local communities, the expansion of programs for students with handicaps that permitted them to be educated in schools within their local communities, and the depopulation of large residential facilities.

Among separate residential facilities, the reverse pattern was found; the public residential facilities responding to both surveys lost 12,749 students (a decline of 40 percent), while private residential facilities gained 2,181 students (an increase of 18 percent). In particular, State-operated facilities have experienced a decline in their school-age populations as part of the deinstitutionalization movement and in association with the increased capacity of local public school programs to serve handicapped students. The aging out of a cohort of sensory impaired, particularly hearing impaired, students has also affected public residential schools.

The most important shifts in the nature of disabilities served in separate facilities, based on data from the facilities reporting in both 1979 and 1988 (see Table V.2), have been:

- Decreases in the proportion of students in separate facilities who have mild or moderate mental retardation, particularly in public separate day schools but in other types of separate facilities as well
- Increases in the proportion of severely or profoundly mentally retarded students in public separate day schools, paralleled by decreases in the proportion of such students in public residential facilities
- Increases in the proportion of students with emotional disturbance or behavior problems among the students at all separate schools, but particularly at private day schools and both public and private residential facilities
- Decreases in the proportion of students with hearing impairments in private schools

Based on these data, it appears that day schools, which were primarily serving students with mild or moderate mental retardation in 1979, were by 1988

TABLE V.2

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY PRIMARY HANDICAPPING CONDITION
AT SEPARATE FACILITIES SURVEYED IN 1979 AND 1988

	1979 OCR Survey[a]			1988 OSEP Survey[b]		
	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total
DAY SCHOOLS						
Mild/moderate retardation	64.3	17.5	30.0	21.0	11.5	14.8
Severe/profound retardation	18.2	4.9	8.4	58.6	8.0	25.5
Seriously emotionally disturbed	2.6	16.4	12.7	4.2	22.3	16.1
Learning disabled	1.5	17.6	13.3	0.1	12.0	7.9
Speech impaired	0.5	5.7	4.3	2.0	6.0	4.6
Deaf and blind	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
Orthopedically impaired	1.2	7.7	5.9	0.6	9.2	6.2
Visually handicapped	0.5	1.2	1.0	0.3	1.2	0.8
Deaf or hard of hearing	6.3	9.0	8.3	5.0	5.2	5.1
Health impaired	0.2	1.2	1.0	1.6	3.7	3.0
Multihandicapped	4.2	14.5	11.7	4.4	16.1	12.1
Other children	0.5	4.2	3.2	2.4	4.6	3.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES						
Mild/moderate retardation	9.6	10.4	9.9	3.5	5.0	4.1
Severe/profound retardation	37.3	2.5	27.8	21.3	4.8	14.3
Seriously emotionally disturbed	9.7	33.8	16.3	26.4	47.8	35.5
Learning disabled	0.1	7.2	2.0	0.9	6.4	3.2
Speech impaired	0.1	0.7	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.5
Deaf and blind	0.9	2.4	1.3	0.6	0.0	0.4
Orthopedically impaired	1.0	1.5	1.1	2.0	1.9	2.0
Visually handicapped	8.0	2.5	6.5	9.6	2.4	6.6
Deaf or hard of hearing	25.0	23.0	24.4	27.1	13.3	21.2
Health impaired	0.2	3.2	1.0	1.1	4.6	2.6
Multihandicapped	6.7	10.2	7.7	6.2	12.7	9.0
Other children	1.4	2.5	1.7	0.8	0.8	0.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a]SOURCE: 1978-79 OCR Survey of Special Purpose Facilities.

[b]SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this Study for the Office of Special Education Programs.

NOTE: Because the facilities represented in this table were a nonrandom subset of the total population of facilities--that is, they were selected because they had previously been surveyed in the 1978-79 OCR Survey of Special Purpose Facilities which did not include the full universe of facilities in operation at that time--the statistics presented here are not based on weighted data and cannot be generalized to all facilities that may have been in existence since 1979.

primarily serving students with severe or profound mental retardation. The decreases in the numbers and proportions of students with mental retardation in residential facilities are associated with the efforts to reduce the total population, and particularly the school-age population, in large public residential institutions (White et al., 1988). At the same time, rapid increases have been noted generally in the placement of children and youth in psychiatric facilities (Darton, 1989), while demographic trends, particularly the aging of hearing impaired students affected by the rubella epidemic, have been associated with the decreases in the number and proportion of hearing impaired students.

As expected from the changes in the types of handicapping conditions served, separate facilities generally reported an increase in the overall severity of impairment among their students compared with students in 1976 (see Table V.3). While this increase in severity of impairment was reported by the majority of all types of separate facilities, both public and private and day and residential, public facilities and residential facilities were more likely to report more severely involved students now than in the past. Overall, very few facilities reported that their students were less severely impaired.

Reports by current administrators indicate that separate day facilities are serving more students in the birth through 5-year-age range, particularly in public separate day schools (see Table V.4). Factors for similar changes among the case study facilities included an increased emphasis on early intervention and the availability of public funding for such programs. Among

TABLE V.3

REPORTED CHANGE IN SEVERITY OF IMPAIRMENT OF STUDENT POPULATIONS OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS OPERATING IN 1976 AND 1988

	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Multiple Handicap	Total
DAY SCHOOLS					
Public					
More severely handicapped	72.4	66.0	*	*	66.6
About the same	25.3	32.2	*	*	28.6
Less severely handicapped	*	*	*	*	4.8
Private					
More severely handicapped	52.6	78.5	60.7	63.8	54.0
About the same	34.0	*	19.0	27.3	30.4
Less severely handicapped	*	*	20.3	*	15.6
All Day Schools					
More severely handicapped	66.6	69.2	65.6	64.6	61.4
About the same	27.8	27.2	22.5	30.4	29.4
Less severely handicapped	5.5	3.6	11.9	*	9.2
RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS					
Public					
More severely handicapped	*	89.0	74.1	*	82.5
About the same	*	6.6	19.3	*	13.2
Less severely handicapped	*	4.4	*	*	4.3
Private					
More severely handicapped	*	77.8	73.7	*	71.2
About the same	*	13.9	24.5	*	23.9
Less severely handicapped	*	8.3	1.8	*	4.9
All Residential Schools					
More severely handicapped	*	85.1	73.8	88.1	75.2
About the same	*	9.1	23.5	*	20.1
Less severely handicapped	*	5.7	2.7	*	4.7

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

NOTES: Data for this table were reported by 954 of the 984 facilities in the day school sample and 499 of the 514 facilities in the residential facility sample that reported they were open in 1976.

*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances using standard methods.

TABLE V.4

AVERAGE PERCENT INCREASE OR DECREASE IN PROPORTION OF STUDENTS BY AGE IN SEPARATE DAY SCHOOLS OPERATING IN 1976 AND 1988

	Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impairment	Multiple Handicap	Total
DAY SCHOOLS						
Public						
0-5 years	*	8.3	*	*	*	4.7
6-17 years	*	-10.7	*	*	*	-5.3
18-21 years	*	2.4	*	*	*	0.6
Private						
0-5 years	-0.6	3.5	-1.0	*	*	3.5
6-17 years	-8.3	0.3	2.5	*	*	-5.1
18-21 years	8.9	3.8	-1.5	*	*	1.6
All Day Schools						
0-5 years	3.1	7.1	-0.1	*	7.6	4.2
6-17 years	-7.7	-8.0	2.3	*	-8.4	-5.2
18-21 years	4.6	0.9	-2.2	*	0.4	1.0
RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES						
Public						
0-5 years	*	-4.3	0.4	*	*	-2.2
6-17 years	*	-14.2	-2.3	*	*	-11.8
18-21 years	*	18.5	1.9	*	*	14.0
Private						
0-5 years	*	*	-0.6	*	*	0.9
6-17 years	*	*	1.2	*	*	-7.8
18-21 years	*	*	-0.6	*	*	6.9
All Residential Facilities						
0-5 years	*	0.4	-0.5	-0.8	-2.5	0.0
6-17 years	*	-24.2	0.8	-1.3	-9.1	-9.0
18-21 years	*	24.8	-0.3	0.5	11.6	9.0

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

Data for this table were reported by facilities with 38,942 of the 107,036 students (unweighted) in facilities that reported they were open in 1976.

*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances using standard methods.

residential facilities, there appears to have been little change in the pre-school-age population, but more students age 18 or older are being served, due in large part to the decline in the proportion of residential populations of school-age (ages 6 through 17). This decline was particularly notable in facilities serving mentally retarded persons, which is associated with the deinstitutionalization movement. Case study facilities operating private residential programs that serve students with emotional disturbance noted that they were receiving more referrals in mid- to late-adolescence, when more severe behavioral or functional problems become manifest in school and community settings.

Nationally, separate facilities reported only small differences between their 1979 and 1988 student populations in terms of age or racial and ethnic distributions.

In response to changes in their student populations, some separate facilities have made changes in their general approach or mission. In some residential facilities, particularly State-operated facilities, special education services are no longer provided by facility staff but are provided either on- or off-campus by the local public school district. Across the nation, about 20 percent of State-operated programs for mentally retarded persons, 10 percent of State-operated programs for emotionally disturbed students, and 15 percent of all State-operated programs for students with handicaps did not report the costs of educational services in their operating budgets. In the vast majority of these cases the local school district or an intermediate education unit provides special education to students residing in those institutions.

Separate facilities have also built upon their expertise by providing information, technical assistance, and training to other agencies and providers in their States. This has been particularly the case for State residential schools for sensory impaired students, but was noted by private schools as well. Specific examples of the types of outreach services provided by the case study facilities included:

- Assisting in the evaluation of students with severe impairments
- Conducting workshops and seminars for local education agency (LEA) staff both on the campus of the facility as well as in local districts
- Cooperating with the SEA, professional associations, or other groups to hold State-wide conferences on state-of-the-art instructional approaches and other topics of interest to educators of severely impaired students and students with specific disabilities
- Maintaining up-to-date expertise on technological innovations in computers and other instructional devices, and providing assistance in selecting, implementing, and/or modifying such technology to staff in other programs for sensory impaired students
- Providing support and training to parents of handicapped children, particularly through early intervention programs and parent-infant workshops

B. CHANGES IN FACILITY STAFFING AT SEPARATE FACILITIES

P.L. 94-142 was designed to improve the availability and quality of staff providing special education and related services to students with handicaps through two major mechanisms: (1) the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) process of evaluating and planning for both preservice and in-service staff training needs and (2) the general supervision responsibility of State education agencies over all publicly funded special education

programs, which in many States has meant the direct application of teacher certification and other staff standards in all settings including separate facilities. These provisions have led to changes in staffing.

1. Quality of Staff

There have been substantial changes in the quality of instructional staff since 1976, noted by the current administrators at separate facilities. Table V.5 indicates that, nationally, large majorities (over 80 percent) of administrators at separate facilities of all types (day and residential, public and private) reported that instructional staff have more appropriate training than in the past. The case study facilities confirmed this trend, as well as the increased prevalence of certification and/or licensure among staff. In approximately half of the case study facilities, teachers of the facility were more often certified and/or licensed, depending on relevant State regulations. This change occurred in all types of facilities, and a factor influencing this change was uniformly reported to be State certification standards. The availability of enhanced State technical assistance and training was noted by one-third of the case study facilities as a reason for the change. More than half of the facilities indicating that staff were better qualified attributed the higher quality of staff to improved preservice training, and a number indicated that a higher quality of staff resulted from the continuing education requirements of the State.

2. Type of Staff Employed

Almost all the case study facilities indicated that the type of educational staff whom they employ have changed in the years since

TABLE V.5

PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS AGREEING WITH STATEMENT REGARDING CHANGES IN STAFF QUALITY

As compared with 1976, instructional staff hired by the facility has more appropriate training.	Primary Disability Served by the Facility		
	Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	All Schools
DAY PROGRAMS			
Public	92.3	*	86.7
Private	89.6	84.1	83.3
RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS			
Public	80.5	82.0	83.0
Private	88.3	86.2	86.7

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances using standard methods.

P.L. 94-142. One-quarter noted hiring teachers for multiply handicapped and/or more severely handicapped students. These differences in staff composition were attributed largely to changing student populations and the resulting programmatic changes. One-quarter of the facilities also had more vocational teachers and transition staff (e.g., those involved in living skills, prevocational training, and community-based programs) than in the past, again reflecting changes in student needs.

In addition to changes in the instructional staff, more than half of the case study facilities (all but one of them were local public or private facilities) were employing more related services personnel than in the past. In particular, more nurses, other medical staff, occupational therapists, physical therapists, speech and language therapists, social workers, and psychologists were on staff or under contract than had been true in earlier years.

3. Ease of Recruiting and Retaining Staff

Nationally, substantial proportions of separate facilities reported serious problems in recruiting appropriate instructional and related-services staff (see Table V.6). Slightly more than half of the case study facilities found it harder to hire staff than in the past. While this was particularly true for occupational and physical therapists, recruitment was also a problem for nurses, speech and language therapists, teachers of the emotionally disturbed, and teachers jointly certified for two or more handicapping conditions or for a handicapping condition and another area of education such as vocational education.

TABLE V.6

PERCEPTION OF PERSONNEL PROBLEMS AT SEPARATE FACILITIES

(Percent of Schools Reporting Problem as Very Serious)

Administrative Problem Areas	Day Facilities	Residential Facilities
PUBLIC		
Recruiting professional staff with the necessary certification in special education or related services	31.2	34.8
Recruiting professional staff with the necessary expertise for your particular program	38.9	43.6
Obtaining/coordinating services or qualified related services providers	32.2	19.7
PRIVATE		
Recruiting professional staff with the necessary certification in special education or related services	43.6	29.7
Recruiting professional staff with the necessary expertise for your particular program	44.6	33.2
Obtaining/coordinating services of qualified related services providers	19.9	14.7

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

See Tables V.7 and V.8 in Part Two of Volume II for more detailed breakdowns.

NA = Not Applicable

One-quarter of the case study facilities, operated either by State or private agencies, believed that staff were harder to find because school districts could offer higher salaries than could these facilities. At some facilities, staff maintained that unionization in other types of facilities serving similar populations had led to higher salaries, making it more difficult to find qualified staff. State requirements for teachers to hold joint certification such as those mentioned above, requirements that related services personnel be certified to work with school-age children or in school settings, requirements that substitute teachers have certification for a particular handicapping condition, and requirements that bus drivers have special training have meant that some case study facilities experience more difficulties in finding the staff they needed. Further, the need for particular types of staff to serve the increasingly severely impaired populations of these facilities undoubtedly influenced the perception that it was harder to find various types of staff than in the past.

Almost a quarter of the case study facilities, serving either emotionally disturbed or mentally retarded students, found it harder than in the past to retain staff; most of these were programs operated by local school districts or intermediate education units. The principal reason for problems in retention was reported to be teacher burnout.

4. Staff-to-Student Ratios

Based on a comparison of data from the 1978-79 OCR Survey of Special Purpose Facilities and the 1988 Survey of Separate Facilities for facilities responding in both years, little change was noted in the ratio of instructional staff to students.

5. Staff Development

While national data on changes in staff development activities are not available, staff development at the case study facilities was reported by have changed in several ways in the years following P.L. 94-142.

Almost uniformly at the case study facilities, the topics of staff in-service presentations and other forms of staff development have changed over the years; for example, one-third of the facilities noted that topics had moved from a compliance orientation to topics more directly related to student needs, such as behavior management, drugs, vocational education, and technology. Other topics not previously addressed were mastery-based curricula, transitioning, child abuse, secondary handicaps, early intervention services, autism, suicide, and functional skills development.

The principal reason for these changes in staff development topics was perceived to be the changing or new student populations of the facilities; topics had also changed due to the State education agency technical assistance, training, program development, and dissemination related to staff development. Resource/materials centers for special education, funded or operated by the SEA, were also reported to provide useful workshops and seminars for facility staff on new topics. Changing staff development topics were also associated with changing State standards related to certification and continuing education, SEA emphasis on staff development during monitoring, and new facility practices and leadership.

In three-fourths of the case study facilities visited, facility staff reported that opportunities for staff development were greater than in the past. Slightly more than half of the facilities reported that the source of

these greater opportunities was the State education agency, either from the agency itself or through resource/materials centers operated by the SEA. Thus, SEA technical assistance and training were noted as highly influential in expanding access to staff development activities and resources. Increases in opportunities were also created by additional funding from the State, frequently through the general education reform movement or with EHA monies, and several facilities noted that the monitoring of State staff requirements had led to the creation of more opportunities for staff development by the facility. Other factors associated with increased opportunities included the initiative of facility leadership, more opportunities provided by other agencies and organizations, including local education agencies, associations, other State agencies, and universities, and negotiated union contracts requiring more staff development than in the past.

The case study facilities generally reported that, since 1975, staff development had become more systematically related to needs assessments and students' needs. The facilities noting this change tended to be those operated by LEAs or IEUs; two-thirds of these facilities, but no private facilities, reported this change. The more systematic relationship between needs assessments and students' needs, and staff development, generally occurred in the form of staff committees, staff surveys, and the establishment of master staff development plans. Almost all of the case study facilities reporting increased coordination of needs and staff development activities maintained that State requirements related to certification, continuing education, and mandated needs assessments for staff development had led to

this change. A few also gave credit to staff initiative in the greater integration of needs assessments, students' needs, and staff development.

Improvements in the quality of staff development activities were noted by one-third of the case study facilities. Several case study facilities indicated that better staff development stemmed from the various program development and dissemination activities related to staff development and from technical assistance and training provided by the State education agency in the post-P.L. 94-142 era; this information and training came to the facilities principally through State-funded resource/materials centers. The availability of more State monies to spend on staff development than in the past and the initiative of facility staff were factors credited by several facility administrators in providing higher-quality staff development activities.

6. Staff Evaluation

According to the case study facilities, staff evaluation practices remained more stable in the years following the passage of P.L. 94-142 than did staffing patterns and staff development activities. Almost half of the case study facilities reported that no change had occurred in staff evaluation procedures since 1975; however, changes were mentioned more frequently by local public special education facilities. Nevertheless, a limited number of types of changes in staff evaluation were noted by the respondents in other types of facilities.

C. CHANGES IN STUDENT INTEGRATION AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

In addition to providing instruction and related services to handicapped students, programs in separate facilities for handicapped students also plan

for other aspects of students' educational experiences. Two of these aspects are (1) opportunities given to students for interaction with nonhandicapped peers and others in the community outside the separate facility, and (2) opportunities to involve and support parents, beyond their mandated participation in planning and reviewing their children's educational placement and services.

1. Opportunities for Interaction with Nonhandicapped Peers

One of the defining characteristics of separate facilities is that students do not generally interact with their nonhandicapped peers during the course of the school day and, if the facility is residential, during nonschool hours as well. However, in line with the expectation that the goal for individuals with handicaps is to develop potential for growth and independence, most separate facilities provide opportunities for interaction, commensurate with the student's needs and abilities as facility staff perceive them.

Nationally, between 50 and 65 percent of separate facilities, depending upon whether they operated day or residential programs and whether they were operated by public or private agencies, reported that students in 1988 had more opportunities for interaction with nonhandicapped peers compared with students in 1976 (see Table V.7). This change was less evident in facilities serving emotionally disturbed students and more evident in those facilities serving students with mental retardation. The case study facilities provide examples of the specific types of changes, including:

- Increased opportunities for interaction associated with transition activities or more joint programming with local public school programs

TABLE V.7

PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS AGREEING WITH STATEMENT ABOUT
CHANGE IN OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERACTION WITH NONHANDICAPPED PEERS

As compared with 1976, students at the facility have more opportunities to interact with nonhandicapped peers.	Primary Disability Served by the Facility		
	Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	All Schools
DAY PROGRAMS			
Public	69.1	*	65.4
Private	69.5	36.2	50.7
Total	69.2	35.5	59.3
RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS			
Public	64.2	50.3	64.0
Private	70.7	48.3	56.5
Total	67.1	48.8	58.8

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1978 as part of this study.

*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances using standard methods.

- o Increased involvement in community-based activities (such as patronage of local entertainment and stores) as part of training in community living skills
- o Increased use of field trips

The case study facilities also indicated a variety of reasons for these increases in opportunities for student interaction with nonhandicapped peers. For example, the availability of funds was noted by some State-operated facilities as a factor that permitted more field trips and increased cooperation with LEAs. In the latter case, this was achieved by providing the funding necessary to increase suitable programming in the local public schools for students from the separate facility. SEA dissemination of models for community involvement by students with severe and profound retardation, presented at conferences and in publications, was also cited as a factor in increasing opportunities for such students. Generally, increases in the number of field trips were associated more frequently with facility staff's own interest and initiative.

The deinstitutionalization movement and the stress on developing functional life skills were mentioned by facilities for students with mental retardation as changing their expectations about and practices toward student involvement with the community, and as leading them to provide more off-campus activities, including opportunities to practice life skills (such as shopping) in community settings. Case study facilities adding transition programs with trial placements in the student's home school had, by the nature of that program, increased opportunities for interaction with peers during the school day and in extracurricular activities.

2. Parental Involvement

Notification to parents and the involvement of parents in placement and educational programming decisions for their handicapped child are hallmarks of P.L. 94-142. As found in the Survey of Separate Facilities (see Table V.8), a large majority (about 80 percent) of separate facilities reported that facility staff had increased their involvement with parents since 1976. Added or enhanced activities included parent-teacher conferences and other avenues of communication between the facility and parents, workshops or training sessions for parents, parent associations, open houses for parents, and family counseling support.

Among the case study facilities, about half reported increased parental involvement, and reported that the increase was affected most directly by SEA standards developed in response to the IEP provisions of P.L. 94-142 regarding parental involvement. The case study facilities indicated that the IEP requirements had forced even reluctant parents to become more involved in the educational decisions affecting their children. Several also specifically mentioned that the focus on evidence of parental involvement during compliance monitoring helped to reinforce their efforts to include parents in the IEP process and had led to an increase in parental involvement.

The initiative of the case study facilities' own teachers or administrators was a key factor in trying to increase parental involvement by setting up parent-oriented activities and programs at several facilities. Activities initiated by the facilities themselves included individual contacts by teachers with parents, the development of a State-wide parent association,

TABLE V.8

PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS AGREEING
WITH STATEMENT ABOUT CHANGE IN CONTACT WITH PARENTS

As compared with 1976, facility staff has had increased contact with parents.	Primary Disability Served by the Facility		
	Mental Retardation	Emotional Disturbance	All Schools
DAY PROGRAMS			
Public	88.1	*	83.2
Private	80.2	80.5	80.0
Total	86.0	77.4	81.9
RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS			
Public	80.3	72.4	78.5
Private	83.8	76.4	77.1
Total	82.3	74.4	78.0

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

*Indicates estimates for which sample size is judged insufficient to permit reliable statistical inference. In addition, where the percentages reported are zero or 100, it is not possible to calculate sampling variances using standard methods.

the provision of parent-infant institutes, and the provision of family counseling.

At several case study facilities, the parent notification standards derived from EHA were the impetus for facilities to develop specific parent outreach efforts--the mailing of IEPs and student progress reports to parents of students in a State facility for persons with mental retardation, and parent conferences to keep parents of emotionally disturbed students in private facilities informed of their rights. Some public facilities for mentally retarded students made note of the use of EHA-B set-aside funds to sponsor parent training at the facility. The availability of SEA staff to participate in parent training and workshops at the facility was also noted by some facilities as a factor in their ability to provide parent workshops.

Several case study facilities mentioned the greater severity of impairments among students, particularly mentally retarded students, as an important factor in increased parental involvement. In particular, their student populations had become more severely impaired, multiply handicapped, and/or medically involved, and these facilities indicated that the increased need by parents for information and support in managing specialized therapy and medical requirements, as well as in reinforcing and developing functional skills, was associated with increased parental involvement both in their children's individual education program and in parent groups and activities at the facility.

D. CHANGES IN PROGRAMS AND METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AT SEPARATE FACILITIES

The emphasis of many programs for severely handicapped persons, including educational programs, has shifted toward the development of functional skills,

including those which are geared specifically toward preparing persons with handicaps to live and work as independently as possible within the community. Federal legislation has both initiated and reflected these changes in general social values and programmatic focus. In American society, providing access to education is a public responsibility, affording individual citizens the opportunity to develop their potential and contribute to the society's well-being. P.L. 94-142 established the fundamental right of all school-age children with handicaps to a "free appropriate public education" guided by written educational plans developed specifically for each individual child (Section 602). Section 626 of P.L. 98-199 (the 1983 Amendments to EHA) recognized that much more needed to be done for all handicapped students in this regard, and expanded provisions for individualized instruction, instruction in practical daily living/socialization skills, vocational education, and transition programming.

1. Individualized Education and Transition Plans

One of the central requirements of P.L. 94-142 was the development and periodic re-evaluation of individualized education plans (IEPs) for each handicapped student. This requirement received considerable attention in the first years after the passage of EHA through SEA monitoring and technical assistance activities. It is not surprising, then, to find that, nationally, virtually all (99 percent of) separate facilities now routinely monitor student progress against the IEP and conduct annual or more frequent re-evaluations or revisions of the IEP. The national data from the Survey of Separate Facilities also indicate that separate facilities experienced considerable change after 1976 in the use of individualized approaches to

educational programming (see Table V.9). Increases in the provision of individually tailored educational programs and the monitoring of individual educational progress were reported by about 90 percent or more of separate facilities, whether day or residential, public or private.

Unlike the IEP, which was required beginning in 1977 for all students with handicaps under P.L. 94-142, specific plans for individual students to facilitate their move from one educational setting to another or from the educational system to the adult social service system and community life are of more recent origin. Transition planning has become increasingly important as more and more handicapped students are likely to have a series of placements before leaving school and entering the community. National estimates from the Survey of Separate Facilities for the average length of stay in a particular separate facility are 6.4 years for students in day programs and 4.2 years for students in residential facilities. The average length of stay in facilities for students with emotional disturbance is much lower than the average for day or residential programs for students who are mentally retarded or for separate school students in general.

Parents, educators, advocates, and handicapped persons themselves are especially concerned with the lack or paucity of training, residential, and other support services for handicapped adults and with the difficulties in arranging and maintaining these services where they exist. Nationally, while large proportions of separate facilities report an increase since 1976 in their ability to find appropriate placements for students leaving their programs, a substantial number (about 30 percent) continue to encounter

TABLE V.9

PERCENT OF ADMINISTRATORS AGREEING WITH STATEMENTS
REGARDING CHANGES IN USE OF INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PLANS

	As compared with 1976,	
	the facility provides more individualized program planning	the facility monitors individual educational development more closely
DAY SCHOOLS		
Public	87.7	92.0
Private	89.6	85.6
Total	88.8	89.3
RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES		
Public	97.3	96.0
Private	92.5	91.2
Total	94.1	93.0

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

See Tables II.5 and II.6 in Part Three of Volume II for more detailed breakdowns.

serious problems in securing residential, educational, and vocational arrangements for students (see Table V.10).

Half of the case study facilities now using formal transition plans noted that SEA requirements were a major reason for instituting these plans. Attention paid in SEA monitoring to transition plans and the influence of SEA technical assistance, training, or information on transition planning, including manuals, guidelines, and forms for developing and documenting individual transition plans, were cited as specific SEA procedures affecting change. Facilities more involved in formal transition planning also sometimes attributed this change to the increased needs of the more severely impaired students and noted that their staff took the initiative in responding to those needs.

According to the case study facilities, the types of transition support reported by large numbers of separate facilities nationally were of long standing. Only a few of the case study facilities mentioned specific changes in transition practices since 1975, other than in the areas of vocational and life skills training (see Section 2 below). Only efforts to provide more systematic follow-up of students after they leave the separate facility were cited as a change in facility practice. The factors mentioned with regard to this change were more complex student needs and staff initiatives to respond to those needs.

2. Changes in Life Skills and Vocational Education

The Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1983 (P.L. 98-199) recognized and addressed the importance of social and vocational skills for

TABLE V.10

PERCENT OF SEPARATE FACILITIES REPORTING CHANGES AND VERY SERIOUS PROBLEMS IN SECURING APPROPRIATE PLACEMENTS FOR EXITING STUDENTS

	Day			Residential		
	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total
Increase since 1976 in ability to secure appropriate placements	70.6	71.8	71.0	72.2	66.8	68.6
Current very serious problems in securing appropriate residential placements	NA	NA	NA	36.5	34.4	35.1
Current very serious problem in securing appropriate educational or vocational placements	30.4	26.5	29.1	29.2	31.5	30.8

SOURCE: Survey of Separate Facilities, conducted in 1988 as part of this study.

NA = Not Applicable

handicapped students by expanding provisions for programs to address these needs. In addition, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-524) mandated that students with handicaps have access to public vocational education programs. Three-quarters of the 24 case study facilities reported having either life skills or vocational education programs or both currently in operation.

Most of the case study facilities that currently have either life skills or vocational education programs reported that there had been a major emphasis placed on developing these programs since 1975, since the goal for their students had more often become community-based rather than institutional placements as adults. Changes in the student population, particularly in terms of the severity of impairment, had also increased the emphasis placed on pre-vocational and job-readiness training.

Life skills programs at the case study facilities were generally conducted on campus and focused on functional and community living skills, ranging from basic personal care to how to manage an apartment and handle a budget. Because educational programs for mentally retarded persons have traditionally focused on life skills training, it is not surprising that life skills programs were much more common among case study facilities serving mentally retarded students (in which 70 percent of the facilities had such programs) than in facilities for students with sensory impairments (25 percent) or emotional disturbances (20 percent). However, separate facilities for students with sensory and emotional impairments have over time come to serve more multiply handicapped persons and persons with mental retardation

in addition to other impairments. As they have done so, they have developed a greater emphasis on life skills training.

Among the 24 case study facilities, three on-campus independent living programs were begun in the mid-1980s or later. Typically, these programs provided a small group of selected students with the opportunity to live in a small residential environment, resembling as closely as possible a community-based setting. The purpose of these programs was to provide students with the experience of living in an environment in which they were responsible for many more aspects of their own daily lives than they were in the dormitories. Students in these independent living programs were generally expected to share such chores as cleaning, preparing foot, doing laundry, and in some cases preparing a budget and planning expenditures.

These independent living programs were developed in response to student needs, staff initiatives, and, in one case, the deinstitutionalization policies of the State department of mental retardation. One facility gave credit to the technical assistance and information available through the SEA division of special education, particularly through State-wide conferences, in helping set up and improve its independent living program.

The single most frequently made change in educational programming mentioned by the case study facilities was an increased emphasis on vocational preparation and training, with half of the facilities reporting an increase in vocational education in the classroom setting or in vocational experience programs, especially in off-campus settings.

The availability of grants or other specifically targeted funding for program development, particularly EHA-B and Federal vocational education

funds, was considered important in providing opportunities for program development and experimentation in vocational education, particularly by State-operated programs. One facility also noted that the ability to use the higher reimbursement formula for a special education vocational program, rather than the lower allocation under general vocational education, allowed it to expand its vocational program. SEA-provided assistance and training also aided in the development of programs in vocational education. The facilities noting the impact of SEA program development and dissemination activities overlapped partially with those mentioning technical assistance and training.

3. Increased Use of Treatment and Behavioral Goals in Educational Programming

About one-fifth of the case study facilities reported an increased use of behavior management or modification techniques since 1975. All but one of the facilities reporting these types of changes were residential programs for emotionally disturbed students. Other case study facilities for emotionally disturbed students noted that they had increased the amount of therapy or treatment services that they provide to their students, as the emotional problems among their students had become more severe.

More integrated educational and treatment or residential programming were mentioned by one-quarter of the case study facilities, equally distributed among the three handicapping conditions of mental retardation, sensory impairments, and emotional disturbance. Facilities for students with mental retardation were predominant among those mentioning the increased use of

related services staff and special assistive devices in the educational setting. The principal factor in the increased use of therapeutic or related services in educational programming was a change in the characteristics of the student population, particularly in the severity of impairments and the prevalence of multiple handicapping conditions.

4. Program Evaluation

Almost three-quarters of the case study facilities noted some change in program evaluation since 1975. Just less than one-third of the facilities (all but one publicly operated) reported that they had initiated program evaluation since 1975. In most cases, this involved some form of self-evaluation and assessment activities, but a few facilities set up computerized student data bases or hired an outside consultant to determine changes needed in the facility's programs.

State requirements for program evaluation and the examination of evaluation activities during monitoring were mentioned by about half of the case study facilities initiating program activities as important factors in their decision, while an equal number undertook program evaluation activities on their own initiative. About half of the facilities initiating program evaluations also gave credit to the division of special education or to the SEA-funded resource/materials center for helping them develop an evaluation program; the help they received included bulletins and other publications containing ideas and approaches for program evaluation, manuals on program evaluation, and technical assistance from a program specialist in evaluation.

About one-quarter of the public case study facilities mentioned that program evaluation had increased in intensity or quality. Factors mentioned by these facilities were State requirements and monitoring regarding evaluation activities, the initiative of the facility director and/or staff, and involvement in external accreditation.

VI. SUMMARY

Since the passage of P.L. 89-313 and P.L. 94-142, there have been major changes in the roles of Federal, State, and local education agencies in providing and overseeing special education programs for students with handicaps, including those offered in day and residential separate facilities. Like special education programs in other settings, separate facilities have noted changes in many aspects of their practice directly addressed by EHA--for example, in increased individualized program planning and evaluation, parental involvement, and to some extent opportunities for more interaction with nonhandicapped peers. Other changes in educational programming have also been seen, affected by a number of factors, including changes in social expectations about the developmental potential and life contributions of handicapped persons. For example, increased emphasis is being placed on life skills and vocational training and on planning for the transition from school to adult life. While these changes have been taking place, the contribution of separate facilities to the continuum of educational services for handicapped children and youth has remained stable in terms of the proportion of students with handicaps served in separate facilities, and has increased in terms of their role in educating students with severe and/or multiple handicaps and students outside the traditional school-age population, both younger and older students.

State education agency procedures have played a significant role in fostering change at separate facilities, as well as in other special education programs. The importance of SEA standards highlights the impact that

regulations can have on programs, particularly on staff qualifications and on the consistent implementation of procedures, such as program planning and parental participation in decisions for all students. However, independent of these procedural standards, compliance monitoring is reported to have the greatest impact when it is closely linked to technical assistance provided directly to the facility or program being monitored. Likewise, the provision of technical assistance focused directly on the special needs of State-operated and private facilities, particularly those of residential facilities and programs for severely impaired students with low-incidence conditions, is reported to be more effective for those facilities than technical assistance directed at the broader spectrum of special education programs. And, while funding was not mentioned specifically as a factor in program improvements at a large number of facilities, special grants and funds for pilot projects have important impacts on the development of innovative programs, when these funds are available.

These findings suggest several avenues of investigation that could enhance a more complete understanding of the role of State procedures in improving special education programs at separate facilities. For example, research questions with regard to technical assistance include:

- What are the specific characteristics of technical assistance delivery systems that make them particularly accessible to and used by separate facilities?
- How does the way in which the SEA special education division is organized, in terms of allocation of staff and specialization of functions, interact with the technical assistance delivery system and its impact on separate facilities?

- What interagency structures are particularly effective at reducing barriers to the greater involvement of separate facilities in the technical assistance activities offered or supported by the SEA?

- Why is a link between monitoring and follow-up technical assistance especially effective at influencing program improvements?

There are also a related set of issues associated with the use of funds, both Federal set-aside and State, for the development and dissemination of innovative program models and pilot projects. These include:

- What is the total resource allocation within States to technical assistance program development, and what functions are delegated to intermediate units or other entities?

- What factors are associated with the level of funds available for program development and pilot projects within the State division of special education?

- How do States identify and set priorities in terms of funding among various program development options that might be of benefit to separate facilities?

- How effective are various approaches for funding program development activities in influencing instructional practices at separate facilities? For example, do short-term planning grants or "seed money" lead to long-term changes and sustained improvements in programs?

In addition, the relationship between the State's mechanism for funding out-of-district placements and the numbers and categories of students served in separate facilities is worth further investigation, since the characteristics of student populations are a major factor in changes in instructional programs.

Finally, a further investigation of how compliance monitoring has influenced the delivery of special education services to students in separate

facilities is justified, given the important role of this procedure in each State's mandate to supervise the provision of special education to its students with handicaps.

There is also great interest in how changes in facility-level practices, such as in the provision of in-service training or in the use of computers in instruction, may affect student learning and development while at school and performance on the job and in the community once adulthood is reached. Longitudinal studies of special education students would be useful to examine the effectiveness of particular instructional practices and settings on these types of individual outcomes. In addition, differences among students receiving special education services in terms of their handicapping conditions and severity of impairment, as well as in other individual characteristics, call attention to the need for examining the extent to which different instructional approaches and educational settings may be particularly effective for different groups of students.

There were several groups of students and facilities for which separate reliable estimates of numbers and characteristics could not be made using the national survey data. In order to understand the educational programs and student characteristics of these groups--those with handicapping conditions found relatively infrequently in the special education population as a whole (such as hearing impaired, visually impaired, orthopedically impaired, health impaired, and deaf-blind students) or in the population served by separate facilities (such as learning disabled and speech and language impaired students)--special studies would be needed. In particular, further efforts would be required to identify all facilities serving students with these

conditions and to recruit full participation in the data collection by all such facilities.

The list of potential research topics is vast. The Study of Programs of Instruction for Handicapped Children and Youth in Day and Residential Settings provides critically needed national data on separate facilities as the groundwork for future studies.

REFERENCES

American Annals of the Deaf. Vol. 134, no. 2 (Reference), 1989.

Darton, N. (1989, July 31). Committed youth. Newsweek, pp. 66-69.

Education for All Handicapped Children Act (Reg.) Federal Register, August 23, 1977, pp. 42474-42514.

Education for All Handicapped Children Act (stat.), 20 U.S.C. 1401.

Hayward, Becky J. "Access and Quality." Report prepared for the National Assessment of Vocational Education, 1989.

Lakin, K.C., B.K. Hill, R.H. Bruininks, and F.A. Hauber. "A Response to the GAO Report 'Disparities Still Exist in Who Gets Special Education.'" Exceptional Children, vol. 50, no. 1, 1983, pp. 30-34.

Levine, Erwin L., and Elizabeth M. Wexler. P.L. 94-142: An Act of Congress. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1981.

Lavor, Martin L. "Federal Legislation for Exceptional Persons: A History." In Fred J. Weintraub et al. (ed.), Public Policy and the Education of Exceptional Children. Reston, VA: 1976.

Martin, Edwin W. "Breakthrough for the Handicapped: Legislative History." Exceptional Children, vol. 34, 1968, pp. 493-503.

Martin, Edwin W. "New Public Priorities: Education of Handicapped Children." Compact (The Journal of the Education Commission of the States), 1971, pp. 4-7.

Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.D.C., 1972).

Office of Education. A Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-42: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1979.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. Seventh Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education.

(PARC) Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1257 (E.D. Pa. 1971).

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1979.

U.S. Department of Education. Seventh Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 1985.

U.S. Department of Education. Eighth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 1986.

U.S. Department of Education. Ninth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 1987.

U.S. Department of Education. Tenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 1988.

U.S. Department of Education. Eleventh Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 1989.

University of Chicago, School of Social Services Administration. National Survey of Residential Group Care Facilities for Children and Youth. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1983.

University of Minnesota, Center for Residential and Community Services. 1982 National Census of Residential Facilities for Mentally Retarded People. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, 1984.

White, C.C., K.C. Lakin, B.K. Hill, E.A. Wright, and R.H. Bruininks. (1988). Persons with Mental Retardation in State-Operated Residential Facilities: Year Ending June 30, 1987 with Longitudinal Trends From 1950 to 1987. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Department of Educational Psychology.

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
(609) 799-3535

600 Maryland Avenue S.W., Suite 550
Washington, DC 20024-2512
(202) 484-9220